



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 105<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 143

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 13, 1997

No. 19

## House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m.

The Reverend Michael E. Osborne, Grace Presbyterian Church, Ocala, FL, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray. Almighty God, You tell us in Your Word that You live in a high and holy place; that You are the King of all the Earth, before whom the nations tremble, and who will one day judge every person in righteousness.

Yet O Lord, You have also said You dwell with the one who is contrite and lowly in spirit and that You came to seek and to save that which was lost.

So we come before You, Lord, as very needy people, asking You to forgive our sins. We pray for mercy upon this land and these leaders; for peace among the nations; for wisdom as we carry on our work this day; and for humility, that we might grow in our commitment to You and to one another.

We pray this in Your matchless name. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARR] come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. BARR of Georgia led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

### APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES PAGE BOARD

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to section 127 of Public Law 97-377 (2 U.S.C. 88b-3),

the Chair appoints as members of the House of Representatives Page Board the following Members of the House: Mrs. FOWLER of Florida and Mr. KOLBE of Arizona.

### APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF JOHN F. KENNEDY CENTER FOR THE PERFORMING ARTS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to section 2(a) of the National Cultural Center Act (20 U.S.C. 76h(a)), the Chair appoints as members of the Board of Trustees of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts the following Members of the House: Mr. GINGRICH of Georgia and Mr. MCDADE of Pennsylvania.

### APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF BOARD OF REGENTS OF SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of sections 5580 and 5581 of the revised statutes (20 U.S.C. 42-43) the Chair appoints as members of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution the following Members of the House: Mr. LIVINGSTON of Louisiana and Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.

### APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF U.S. HOLOCAUST MEMORIAL COUNCIL

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 96-388, as amended by Public Law 97-84 (36 U.S.C. 1402(a)), the Chair appoints the following Members of the House to the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Council: Mr. GILMAN of New York, Mr. REGULA of Ohio, Mr. LATOURETTE of Ohio and Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania.

### APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF BOARD OF VISITORS TO U.S. AIR FORCE ACADEMY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 9355(a) of title 10, U.S. Code, the Chair appoints as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Air Force Academy the following Members of the House: Mr. HEFLEY of Colorado and Mr. YOUNG of Florida.

### APPOINTMENT AS MEMBER OF BOARD OF VISITORS TO U.S. COAST GUARD ACADEMY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 194(a) of title 14, United States Code, the Chair appoints as a member of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Coast Guard Academy the following Member of the House: Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut.

### APPOINTMENT AS MEMBER OF BOARD OF VISITORS TO U.S. MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 1295 b(h) of title 46, United States Code, the Chair appoints as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy the following Member of the House: Mr. KING of New York.

### APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF BOARD OF VISITORS TO U.S. MILITARY ACADEMY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 4355(a) of title 10, United States Code, the Chair appoints as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Military Academy the following Members of the House: Mrs. KELLY of New York and Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper containing 100% post consumer waste

H527

# APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF BOARD OF VISITORS TO U.S. NAVAL ACADEMY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 6968(a) of title 10, United States Code, the Chair appoints as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Naval Academy the following Members of the House: Mr. GILCHREST of Maryland and Mr. SKEEN of New Mexico.

# APPOINTMENT AS MEMBER OF BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF INSTITUTE OF AMERICAN INDIAN AND ALASKA NATIVE CULTURE AND ARTS DEVELOPMENT

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 1505 of Public Law 99-498 (20 U.S.C. 4412), the Chair appoints to the Board of Trustees of the Institute of American Indian and Alaska Native Culture and Arts Development the following Member of the House: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

# ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will recognize five Members on each side for 1 minute.

# WELCOMING REV. MICHAEL OSBORNE

(Mr. STEARNS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, let me thank you for the opportunity to welcome my pastor from Ocala, FL. He is a minister and pastor from Grace Presbyterian Church. He comes by way of Covenant Presbyterian Church in South Carolina and knows the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. INGLIS] and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. TALENT] well.

I want to welcome him, and of course I also want to tell him how important it is to have him here today. He came up with part of the National Pastors Policy Group that Dr. Jerry Falwell has brought here to Washington as an attempt to establish the restoration of the Judeo-Christian ethic here in America. They are looking for spiritual revival.

Last night we learned from Dr. Falwell and Mike Osborne had the opportunity to listen to him and meet him. I wanted to welcome him here and particularly tell him and Members of this House, this great body, that we can pass all the laws we want here in Washington. Of course, we have a crime bill almost every year, but the real hard work is back in each of our congressional districts by pastors such as Mike Osborne.

If he will preach the gospel and talk about the Judeo-Christian ethic, we will restore what is right to this country and we will not need to pass more and more laws. I request that all of us

will pray for him and pray for our pastors back in the district that they might have the ability to transform all this in our values because the legislation we pass will not do it as quickly and as mightily as he does in the pulpit every Sunday.

So, Mike Osborne, I welcome you to this great body. And I thank the Chair for this opportunity.

# BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT

(Mr. PAUL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, a tremendous amount of energy has been put into the balanced budget amendment movement. The whole debate has perversely served to distract from the important key issue of the level of government expenditures. A balanced budget achieved at \$1.7 trillion offers no benefit whatsoever and a great deal of harm compared to a \$1 trillion budget out of balance. This whole debate over the balanced budget amendment has coopted the important issue of the proper size of government.

If Social Security funds are used to balance the budget, the support for this project will quickly fade. What is generally forgotten in this debate is that the national debt last year rose \$261 billion, a far cry from the much talked about \$107 billion deficit. The math is less clear than alleged.

The deficit problem is a lot more than an accounting problem. Balancing the books or pretending to do so will not solve the problem inherent in a welfare state manipulated by a majority vote for the benefit of the special interests.

# NEIGHBORHOOD PROSECUTION

(Mr. BLAGOJEVICH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BLAGOJEVICH. Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that community policing works. That is why I am here today to recommend the next logical step in grassroots law enforcement: Neighborhood prosecution.

As a former prosecutor, I am proud to introduce a bill that would create a \$10 million pilot program to put prosecutors on the streets of America. These new prosecutors would expand their duties beyond the courtroom and work with residents to spot the causes of crime and aggressively root them out.

One might ask, why should prosecutors care about broken windows, graffiti, dark alleys, and abandoned buildings? Simply put, these conditions breed crime. Studies have shown that a broken window is the first step toward graffiti, which is the first step toward loitering, which is the first step toward gang activity. My plan says, fix the broken window; stop the cycle of crime.

# THE 100th ANNIVERSARY OF THE PTA

(Mr. BARR of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARR of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, our Nation continues to benefit from one of the greatest educational systems on the face of the earth due largely to the efforts of two groups of very special people. I speak not of Washington bureaucrats but rather of the parents and teachers in our local communities who work together tirelessly on behalf of our children.

I proudly commend Parent and Teacher Assoc. across America for their efforts to fight for schools that are safe and in which our children are taught values and knowledge that we hope will last them a lifetime.

I am also proud because Cobb County, GA, in the seventh District of Georgia is the birthplace of Alice McClellan Birney, the original founder of the PTA, which on February 17 celebrates its 100th anniversary. A special service will be held next Monday at Marietta High School in Marietta, GA, commemorating Alice McClellan Birney, and the millions of parents, teachers, and students whose lives she has touched.

On this 100th anniversary of the PTA, I urge my colleagues to join me in honoring Alice McClellan Birney and the millions of men and women of today's PTA's for the commitment and foresight they have exhibited to launch and continue this vital institution, an enduring living legacy to better education in America.

# TUITION CREDITS

(Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, we have a golden opportunity to pass a measure that will help working families and their children secure the education and job training they need to get ahead. In the next few months we will debate a proposal that will provide up to \$10,000 a year in tax deductions to working families so they can send their children to college or vocational school.

Under the plan, parents could also improve their lives through career training. As a former teacher, I know that education is the best way for people to help themselves and for families to improve their lives. Global marketplaces and rapidly developing technologies make it hard to compete with just a high school diploma. In fact, the Census Bureau reports that college graduates earn an average of \$17,000 more than high school graduates every year. Figures like these show what we already know: Educational opportunities translate directly into economic security.

That is why I promised the working families and young people of my district that I would fight to get this tuition deduction passed through this Congress. Please join me in supporting this important initiative.

#### THE TRUTH ABOUT A TYRANT

(Mr. CHABOT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, President Clinton recently rolled out the red carpet for one of the most repugnant figures of our time, Chinese Defense Minister Chi Haotian, better known as the butcher of Tiananmen Square. General Chi ordered the slaughter of hundreds, perhaps thousands of brave Chinese students who were demonstrating for freedom.

The picture of General Chi's tanks rolling in to crush the democracy movement remains etched in our minds forever. It was almost incomprehensible, then, to learn that our President would honor Chi at the White House. I am not sure whether coffee was served but sickeningly our military was ordered to give the butcher a 19-gun salute. Meanwhile Chi denied that the Tiananmen Square massacre ever occurred.

I do believe that we can improve human rights in China by increasing our presence there and promoting American values. Increased contacts with China can help but only if we follow the course set by President Ronald Reagan in speaking the truth about evil. We must not shrink from calling evil by its name, and we must not paper over truth about tyrants such as Chi, no matter what positions they occupy or what ties we are seeking.

#### LUCASVILLE PRISON

(Mr. TRAFICANT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, after a 1993 riot at Lucasville Prison, Ohio taxpayers spent \$353 million to straighten it out. If that is not enough to bust your parakeet, check this out:

To settle a lawsuit filed by the prisoners, the inmates in this prison, Ohio taxpayers must now pay another \$4 million for punitive damages and property damages of these prisoners. Unbelievable, \$4 million to rapists, armed robbers, and murderers.

This Lucasville ordeal is a classic example of how we treat crime in America. The law turns its back on the victims of rapists and murderers, then turns around and compensates rapists and murderers in prison who burned the place down and destroyed it. Beam me up. If there is any sense left, someone explain it to me in writing.

I yield back the balance of any more punitive or property damages.

□ 1015

#### REINTRODUCING THE RICKY RAY HEMOPHILIA RELIEF ACT

(Mr. GOSS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, shortly I will reintroduce the Ricky Ray Hemophilia Relief Fund Act, which gained 249 cosponsors in the last Congress. This bill responds to the tragedy of hemophilia-associated AIDS. In the 1980's nearly half of the hemophilia community became infected with the AIDS virus through the use of tainted blood products. About half of those, approximately 7,200 people, many of whom were children, have already died.

As they did last Congress, students from Robinson Secondary School in Fairfax, VA, have visited Members' offices to lobby for this bill. These bright and articulate students belong to the Distributive Education Clubs of America, an association of high school students enrolled in marketing education courses and committed to the free enterprise system.

Their efforts on behalf of the Ricky Ray bill have been impressive. I hope my colleagues will lend them an ear, cosponsor this bill, and help bring compassionate assistance to hurting victims of the hemophilia community.

#### HOW BEST TO HONOR OUR FLAG

(Mr. SKAGGS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, respect and honor for the flag is a subject again before this House. How best do we do it?

As a Marine veteran, I cherish the symbol of our country's freedoms to which we pledged allegiance just a few minutes ago. But should we amend the Bill of Rights for the first time in our Nation's history? Should we eat into the guarantee of free speech that is the essence of this country in order to protect the flag? The answer is no.

Let us not fall into the mistake of elevating the symbol of our freedoms above our freedoms themselves. This country is strong enough to withstand dissent, even dissent expressed so offensively that it involves the desecration of the flag.

For those who want to reaffirm their love of country and flag, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE] and I are introducing a resolution today that does that but does not amend the Constitution.

Honor the flag? Absolutely. We honor it best by keeping the Constitution as it is. Honoring the freedom that we stand for best honors our flag.

#### TRIBUTE TO STEVE KORPF

(Mr. GUTKNECHT asked and was given permission to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a very special man, a man who loves his family and loves his country, my friend Steve Korpf.

Steve Korpf and I have been friends for about 10 years. He exemplifies what all of us cherish: faith, character, and courage. During our 10-year friendship Steve has been battling various forms of cancer. He is now in a fight that the doctors tell him he is not going to win.

His friends in Mankato, MN, are organizing a tribute and benefit on February 22 to help defray the cost of his long battle. I am pleased to support their efforts and will hopefully be able to be present that evening to honor a truly special American.

My prayers are with Steve and his wife Dorothy as well as his family. I know that my life has been enriched for having known him. Thank you, Steve, for being one of my heroes.

#### IN REMEMBRANCE OF THE LATE HONORABLE PAMELA HARRIMAN, UNITED STATES AMBASSADOR TO FRANCE

(Ms. PELOSI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, as Congress convenes this morning, official and diplomatic Washington is gathering at the National Cathedral to honor and give thanks for the life of our Ambassador to France, Pamela Harriman. Many of us would like to be there but our official duties prevent us from doing so.

As is demonstrated by this portrait of Lafayette in our gallery, along with the only other portrait, that of George Washington, our relationship with France is a very special one, and indeed we sent as our Ambassador our very best.

I know it is a source of great pride to Pamela's family that the President of France eulogized her as well as bestowed upon her France's highest honor. I know it is also a source of pride that the President of the United States and the First Lady will eulogize her today and mourn her passing. I hope it is a comfort to Ambassador Harriman's family that so many people in this House, and indeed so many Americans, join our First Family in mourning this great loss.

Pamela's last weekend, before she took ill and then died during the week, was spent attending the christening of her great-grandchild, her Churchill great-grandchild. What a perfect end to a great life.

I know I speak for many here when I say to Pamela, adieu, and thank you.

#### RESIGNATION FROM THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KINGSTON) laid before the House the

following resignation from the House of Representatives:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, February 13, 1997.

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH,  
Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER GINGRICH: I hereby resign my congressional seat effective immediately so that I can assume my post in the President's Cabinet as Ambassador to the United Nations.

It has been an honor to serve in the United States Congress as New Mexico's third district representative for the past 14 years. I have been especially proud to represent the people of New Mexico whose kindnesses towards me and my family have been equalled only by the unmatched beauty of the state itself.

Sincerely,

BILL RICHARDSON,  
Member of Congress.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, February 13, 1997.

Hon. STEPHANIE GONZALES,

Secretary of State, State Capitol, Santa Fe, NM.

DEAR STEPHANIE: I hereby resign my congressional seat effective immediately so that I can assume my post in the President's Cabinet as Ambassador to the United Nations.

It has been an honor to serve in the United States Congress as New Mexico's third district representative for the past 14 years. I have been especially proud to represent the people of New Mexico whose kindnesses towards me and my family have been equalled only by the unmatched beauty of the state itself.

Sincerely,

BILL RICHARDSON,  
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, a copy of the official letter of resignation from the gentleman of New Mexico, Mr. RICHARDSON, will be submitted to the Secretary of State of New Mexico on this date and will be inserted into the RECORD and the Journal at this point.

There was no objection.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on House Joint Resolution 36 and that I may be allowed to include tabular and extraneous material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

#### APPROVING THE PRESIDENTIAL FINDING REGARDING THE POPULATION PLANNING PROGRAM

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the provisions of section 518(A)(e) of an act making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for fiscal year 1997 (Public Law 104-208), I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 36) approving the Presidential finding

that the limitation on obligations imposed by section 518A(a) of the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 1997, is having a negative impact on the proper functioning of the population planning program.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON].

The motion was agreed to.

□ 1022

#### IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 36 with Mr. DREIER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

By unanimous consent, the joint resolution was considered as having been read the first time.

The text of House Joint Resolution 36 is as follows:

H.J. RES. 36

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the House of Representatives and Senate approve the Presidential finding, submitted to the Congress on January 31, 1997, that the limitation on obligations imposed by section 518A(a) of the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 1997, is having a negative impact on the proper functioning of the population planning program.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to section 518A(e) of the Foreign Operations Appropriations Act for 1997, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] will control 1 hour in opposition to the joint resolution, and the gentleman from California [Ms. PELOSI] will control 1 hour in favor of the joint resolution.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GREENWOOD] and I ask unanimous consent that he be allowed to yield to other Members.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON].

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, today we are considering a resolution which would endorse a finding by the President that the delay until July 1, 1997, in the obligation of funds for international family planning "is having a negative impact on the proper functioning" of the program. This resolution is being considered under expedited procedures as called for in section 518A of the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 1997.

The decision to delay obligations for international family planning funds until July 1, but to require a vote to

release the funds by March 1 of this year pursuant to a finding by the President, is the result of a compromise struck by the House leadership and the White House during negotiations on the Omnibus Consolidated Appropriations Act of 1997. The agreement also calls for a total funding level of \$385 million for international family planning, instead of \$356 million as provided in fiscal year 1996. In addition, funds are apportioned on a monthly basis of not more than 8 percent.

We are not dealing directly in this resolution with the so-called Mexico City policy, because the House has been unable to get the Senate and the White House to agree to it for the past 2 years. The Senate only voted once directly on the policy in the past Congress. On November 1, 1995, by a vote of 53 to 44, it rejected the Mexico City provisions included in the House version of the fiscal year 1996 Foreign Operations Appropriations Act. In addition, the White House threatened to veto such appropriations acts if Mexico City language was included.

The chairman of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN], offered a compromise last year which would have allowed organizations that refused to agree to abide by the Mexico City policy to receive family planning funds, but at a level not to exceed 50 percent of the total provided to each such organization in 1995. Organizations that agreed to abide by the Mexico City policy would not have been capped.

That compromise was endorsed by the House but rejected by the administration. Had it been accepted, we would not be here today and international family planning funds would be flowing without delay in obligations.

This is the second year that the obligation of funds for international family planning has been delayed. As I stated earlier, the House could not reach a compromise with the administration or the Senate on the Mexico City policy as part of the fiscal year 1996 appropriations act and, as a result, delayed obligations until July 1 of that year as well.

However, the obligation delay was explicitly intended to encourage the authorizing committee to address this issue as part of the pending authorization bill for foreign affairs. As passed by the House, the 1995 foreign aid authorization bill included Mexico City policy language. Unable to work out a compromise with the Senate and the administration, all language was dropped in the final conference report on the bill.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that this changes this year. I hope that we do not have to debate this anymore. Policy issues surrounding international family planning should be addressed by the Committee on International Relations, not the Committee on Appropriations. I urge the authorization

committee to resolve this issue so that legislative language on the Mexico City policy does not continue to have a negative impact on the proper functioning of the appropriations process.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of House Joint Resolution 36, the Presidential finding on international family planning funds. As I call on my colleagues to vote for this resolution, I want to remind us all why this vote is occurring.

Our distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, Mr. LIVINGSTON, has presented a long version of it and I will do a brief one. But, first, I want to commend him for the spirit of fairness in which he has enabled this resolution to come to the floor, which is in keeping with his great leadership as chair of our committee.

I also want to recognize the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], who is in opposition to this resolution, has his own resolution on the floor today. I do not think I have ever served with a finer Member of Congress. He is a great champion for child survival issues and human rights issues throughout the world. I have great respect for him. Unfortunately, I disagree with him on this issue, but I want to pay homage to his commitment to child survival issues.

Mr. Chairman, we are here today because of an agreement, as our chairman mentioned, that was entered into in the fall. In order to break an impasse, President Clinton and the House of Representatives, the Republican leadership, entered into an agreement on the foreign aid bill and, indeed, the entire and continuing resolution for fiscal year 1997.

Under the agreement President Clinton agreed to a reduced level of funding for population of \$38.5 million and to a 4-month delay in any obligation to have the funds. The funds would go forward now or March 1 if the President certified to Congress that the delay is having an adverse impact on international family planning programs and the House and Senate vote to approve the President's finding.

Indeed, the President's certification states that further delay will cause serious, irreversible and avoidable harm to the lives and well-being of many thousands of poor women and children throughout the world.

□ 1030

Indeed, the delay undermines U.S. efforts to promote child survival and actually increases the number of abortions worldwide. Evidence from all regions of the world show increased contraceptive use by reducing unintended pregnancies plays a major role in reducing abortions.

I join with many well-known development organizations, such as CARE, World Vision, Save the Children, and

some church-related groups such as Church World Service, Lutheran World Relief, and the National Council of Churches, to name a few, in urging my colleagues to vote yes in accepting the presidential finding.

Mr. Chairman, I want to take the balance of my time to make three points. What do the population funds do, how are they used; second, what they do not do, they do not promote abortions, and how do we monitor that.

U.S. support for international family planning programs emphasizes voluntary family planning as a part of an integrated approach to population and development that includes complementary activities to promote health, the status of women, child survival, and strong families.

The goals of U.S. leadership in global population are: To promote the rights of couples to determine freely and responsibly the number and spacing of their children, improving individual reproductive health, and reducing population growth rates to the levels consistent with sustainable development.

I will put more in the RECORD about the work of our international family planning efforts. Time does not permit me to go into more detail here. However, I will say that gains made from the delivery of services such as immunization, diarrheal control, and nutrition programs for children are most effective and sustainable when combined with programs for women on child spacing, maternal health services, and access to contraceptives.

In fact, in most instances throughout the developing world by sheer necessity the delivery of these programs takes place simultaneously. Inaction today not to accept the President's finding would disrupt child survival and family planning services and will end up costing us dearly both in human and financial terms.

What the population funds do not do: AID's funds are not used for abortion. As this chart indicates very clearly, since 1973, with the enactment of the Helms amendment, AID's population program has been legally prohibited from supporting or encouraging abortion as a method of family planning. I will state these prohibitions specifically, and I have the actual statutes with me at the desk if any one of our colleagues wishes to inspect them.

No USAID funds can be used to pay for the performance of abortions as a method of family planning or to motivate a person to have an abortion. No funds can be used to lobby for or against abortion. No funds can be used to purchase or distribute commodities or equipment for the purpose of inducing abortions as a method of family planning, and no funds can be used to support any biomedical research which relates in whole or in part to methods of or the performance of abortions as methods of family planning.

Strict procedures assure that no AID funds are used by contractors for abortions, and these procedures in place to

ensure that no funds are used include, and I have another chart on that, legally binding contracts that include standard clauses specifically listing prohibited activities. Violators are subject to heavy fines and loss of future funding.

It also includes close technical monitoring for requiring detailed annual work plans, regular independent audits according to Federal acquisition regulations of both contractors and subcontractors.

There have been claims that all population funds will be dispersed without pro-life safeguards if this resolution passes. This is simply not so. It is essential to restart funding for these international family planning programs to promote the health and well-being of millions of families throughout the world.

Mr. Chairman, I do not hesitate to characterize this vote, based on the exploding population growth we are experiencing, as vital to the future of our planet, and one that is first and foremost about providing families with the real means to lift themselves from poverty, provide for their children and live with dignity. We must not hold the poor children of the world hostage to congressional politics. Let us take a step forward today, not backward. Vote "yes" on the resolution.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE], the very distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. HYDE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HYDE. I thank the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, the debate really is not about family planning, although we will hear that term a lot. This is about abortion. Family planning, properly defined, is the matter of getting pregnant or not getting pregnant. It has nothing to do with abortion. True, abortion will hold down the population gain because you are eliminating people, you are killing them, you are exterminating them. But that has not been the policy of our Government and our country. And even now we give lip service to the fact that none of these funds can be used to pay for abortions. But what happens is the money goes to an organization, or organizations, that perform abortions, that counsel for abortions, that lobby for abortions in countries as a means of family planning.

Now, that wall between abortion and family planning should remain in place. Under the legislation of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] every penny of family planning money goes to organizations engaged in family planning, properly defined. It will only be withheld from those organizations that counsel, perform, and promote abortions.

Now, the idea that none of this money can be spent for abortions, I just wish frankly people would understand that we understand money is fungible. And if you provide money for purposes A and B, you are freeing up other money for C and D. So that really is not an argument.

The Mexico City policy, which was the policy until this President assumed office—and 2 days after he was in office, he reversed it—provides that we will support lavishly and generously family planning. I am not objecting to that. But not subsidize—indirectly, or directly, in any way—abortions, and not subsidize organizations that perform abortions. That was the policy. Three hundred fifty foreign organizations agreed to its terms, including the International Planned Parenthood Federation. And they have affiliates in 57 countries. The only one that did not agree, and that is what we are fighting about here, is International Planned Parenthood Federation of London.

So I just suggest, if you think abortions are a good idea, and I do not know anybody that will admit to that, but I do know a lot of policymaking activities that amount to supporting abortion. I hope Members will vote “no” on the President’s finding.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY], a member of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations and, more importantly, a leader in our country on international family planning issues.

(Mrs. LOWEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the privileged resolution to release the funds for international family planning programs on March 1. I have personally visited clinics supported by this aid, and I have seen firsthand the very critical work they are doing for our families, for women, for children, for infants.

Each year approximately 600,000 women worldwide die of pregnancy-related causes, leaving 1 million children without mothers. These are unnecessary, tragic deaths that could be avoided through access to family planning services.

Recently several of my colleagues on the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations and I visited Misr El Kadima, a maternal and child health center in Cairo, Egypt. This center is a success story and is one of the many successful facilities supported by USAID worldwide.

Family planning is just one of the basic health care services provided at the center. The doctors, nurses, laboratory technicians who spoke with us provide immunizations for children, routine prenatal care, treatment for common diseases, general outpatient care, not abortion.

Some of these clinics in Egypt are 5 miles from the nearest city. If these

clinics are shut down, as would happen if these funds do not go forth, what are these women going to do for these vital services? In Cairo and in the rest of the developing world, family planning services are literally a matter of life and death.

In Egypt, largely due to USAID support, contraceptive use has doubled in the last 15 years and the increase has been directly linked to decreases in infant mortality and maternal death. Over the last decade, as the rate of contraceptive use in Egypt rose, the infant mortality rate dropped 42 percent. As the doctors explained, family planning services allow families to plan and space the birth of their children.

If the funds at issue are withheld until July 1, USAID’s main contract in Egypt will be suspended. This disruption would force clinics like the one that I visited to stop providing these life-savings services, and would have a devastating impact on thousands of men, women and children. So let’s be clear—a “no” vote closes clinics that save lives.

I urge you to remember what this vote is really about. This vote isn’t about abortion—the clinic that I visited in Egypt does not provide abortions nor do any United States funds go to abortion services. This vote is about releasing funds for medical services that save the lives of mothers and babies worldwide. Vote for these families. Vote for the resolution.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. MOLINARI].

Ms. MOLINARI. Mr. Chairman, family planning has clearly proven to save the lives of women and infants. Sadly, 1,600 women die every day, 1 woman every minute, of pregnancy-related causes because they do not have access to reproductive health services, including family planning. Nearly half of the women today who die from maternity-related causes would still be alive today if they could have prevented unwanted pregnancy in the first place. Nearly all would be saved if they had access to reproductive health care. By giving women the access to health services they so desperately need during their childbearing years, we will help prevent thousands of maternal deaths. The World Bank estimates improved access to family planning can reduce the number of maternal deaths that occur annually by 20 percent. In addition to that, family planning programs have also helped stop the spread of sexually transmitted diseases, including HIV. Access to contraception is not only crucial in avoiding unwanted pregnancies but in fighting the spread of the ever-growing HIV virus, and we all know these sexually transmitted diseases do not stay within borders and impose immense risk to the overall population. To delay the release of funds until July will result in increased abortions, unintended pregnancies, the further spread of AIDS, and the deaths of thousands of women. Seventeen of the 95 programs will have to be shut down, denying millions of women access to effective contraceptive services. Doctors and nurses will

lose access to obstetrical care, and the treatment of sexually transmitted diseases and community health workers who teach important health intervention, including immunizations and pre- and postnatal care, will be eliminated.

Mr. Chairman, let us give women and their children more control over their childbearing and health-related decisions and families the self-sufficiency they want, the health and the hope that they deserve.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BUNNING].

Mr. BUNNING. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, the question before us today is not whether we should support international family planning and educational programs. The question today is whether or not this Nation or this body supports the use of abortion as a means of family planning.

As far as I am concerned, the terms “family” and “abortion” are totally incompatible. This Nation and this Congress cannot and should not subsidize an organization which advocates abortion or which lobbies for the legalization or expansion of abortion as a means of limiting population growth. We should not allow abortion to become our next major export.

It is true that the Helms amendment prevents the direct use of U.S. funds to pay for abortion procedures. But it does not prevent indirect funds of programs that promote the legalization or expansion of access to abortion as a means of birth control in developing nations. To do that, we must defeat this resolution and reinstate the Mexico City policy.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to defeat this resolution. Help us reinstate the Mexico City policy and show the world that we are willing to support education and other family practices, but not at the expense of the innocent unborn. Vote “no” on this resolution and vote “yes” on the Smith-Hyde-Oberstar substitute.

□ 1045

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. TORRES], a member of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs and a leader on this issue.

(Mr. TORRES asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TORRES. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of this resolution to release on March 1 the funds that we have already agreed to provide for international planning programs.

This is not a vote on abortion. No U.S. funds can be used to lobby or perform abortions; that is already prohibited by law as so well explained by the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI].

This is not a vote to increase funding for family planning programs. The fiscal year 1997 funding level is already

set. We did that last year as part of the foreign operations appropriations bill. This vote is merely to decide when to release the funds. We are already 5 months in arrears in providing for this money. Not a single dime has been appropriated.

Mr. Chairman, I say to my colleagues that this is a pro-family vote, a vote for women's health and survival. To continue to delay in funding will cost, simply, many, many lives. A UNICEF report has found that just meeting the existing demand for family planning in the developing world would reduce unintended pregnancies by one-fifth, thus reducing the 600,000 annual maternal deaths at least by the same amount.

The counterproductive effects of the delay on international family planning programs are detailed in the President's finding. There are country programs here in this hemisphere for which the funding delay would be especially harmful.

In Mexico some nongovernmental organization clinics will potentially close including those in Chiapas, one of the states in Mexico which has tremendous unmet needs for family planning services. Currently, USAID is supporting programs that serve 70,000 people there annually.

In Haiti this May, there will be staff layoffs of thousands of staff people that would help to service men and women who without family planning would have devastating effects.

I urge, I urge a yes vote on this resolution.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. CAMPBELL].

(Mr. CAMPBELL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, the question before us today deals with a just and absolutely essential need in the world. I think my colleagues have made this clear. But one colleague in particular, my dear friend and a man for whom I have a great deal of respect, the gentleman from Illinois, said that abortion and family planning are not related; and of course that is right. Nobody wants abortion as a means of family planning. But that ignores one very important point, and it is true from anybody who has visited family planning centers in the United States.

Many, many women come to a family planning center because they think they are pregnant, and their first exposure to family planning is because they think they are pregnant. That is the truth in the United States; it is demonstrably even more so in the Third World. USAID has done studies on this.

In particular, in Tanzania they found that, when women came in for a legal abortion, only 19 percent had had any education exposure to, or experience with, family planning. And USAID found in Egypt that, when women came in, if they had an abortion, they left, 98 percent of them, aware of family planning. The other study is in Turkey

where the realization of family planning doubled.

So if we say family planning and abortion are not related, we are really missing an important point: the woman who comes to seek assistance most often is going to a place where she believes that she can get an abortion, if that is what she needs, if that is what is legal in her country, but leaves, God willing, never to have another abortion. And that is just blocked with the Mexico City policy because the place where she would go to get the abortion counseling or the abortion services would no longer be there to offer the family planning assistance either.

So that point, I think, has been missed in the debate.

I conclude simply by saying this. My wife and I traveled to India within the last couple of months at our own expense. And we just saw a country, with 40 percent of the world's poor, 17 percent of the world's population. We are our brother's keeper, we are our sister's keeper.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the very distinguished gentlewoman from Florida [Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN], a member of the Committee on International Relations.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition of H.J. Res. 36, for this is a thinly veiled attempt to manipulate the Members of this Chamber into releasing population control funding 4 months prior to the date stipulated in the appropriations bill. The Clinton administration seems to be under the impression that it can invoke waivers on any law or make findings such as these with no concrete evidence to support its contentions, just rhetoric. It is simply an attempt to justify breaking the compromise reached during last year's debate.

Supporters of these programs would have us believe that their objective is to save lives, that these programs are needed because the countries in Latin America and other regions are unable to sustain population growth. However, if they are truly concerned about the well-being of the people of these countries, then why do not they take the \$385 million they want released and apply them toward vaccination programs or better medication to improve child survival rates or better nutrition programs?

The future of all nations is in the hands of today's children who, if given an opportunity, will become the leaders of tomorrow. Yet these population programs are directly and purposefully advocating abortion as a form of birth control, and by doing so they are helping to deprive these countries of their potential.

Abortion should never be promoted as family planning.

The United States commits a grave mistake in always assuming that it knows what is best for others. Are we to be so patronizing of our neighbors in the hemisphere and other regions to

think that we know what their society needs better than they do?

It seems that the Clinton administration is not content with increasing government intervention in the affairs of U.S. citizens. Apparently, it now feels the need to run the lives of individuals in other countries, dictating what is best for women whose social, cultural, and religious backgrounds differ greatly from those of the United States.

But the problem goes beyond this argument and the promotion of abortion. These population control programs are also being interpreted as licenses to conduct widespread sterilization of women in Latin America, in the Caribbean, and in other regions. We have received numerous accounts from Central America, for example, of women who have been asked general questions about their families, their economic situation, and then about whether or not they want more children. This then is translated by those involved with the population control programs as a request for sterilization without the express consent or full knowledge of the women, and these procedures are performed. By the time these women realize what has taken place, it is far too late.

How can we possibly release the funds for such activities?

In summary: This bill is unjust, offensive, and should not be passed. I urge my colleagues to defeat this measure.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT].

(Mr. BOEHLERT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the resolution.

I do so for one overriding reason: it will save lives. In fact, it's rare that we get to cast a vote that will result in such direct, immediate, tangible and unarguable benefits.

International family planning agencies depend on this money—money which, remember, we have already appropriated.

The work of these agencies saves the lives of women not only by enabling them to prevent life-threatening pregnancies, but by providing basic health care services. Their work also helps save the lives of children who are born into such grinding poverty that they literally cannot survive. And their work helps eliminate misery by stemming the overpopulation that makes life unbearable in so many parts of the world.

Indeed, UNICEF has noted that "family planning could bring more benefits to more people at less cost than any other single technology now available to the human race." That's an extraordinary statement, and it is no exaggeration.

Family planning also prevents abortions. The World Health Organization estimates that 40 percent of unintended pregnancies end in abortion—40 percent.

Anyone who wants to prevent abortions—and I think that includes those of us who are pro-choice—should vote for this resolution.



None of the funds being released can be used to perform abortions, and the services provided with these funds eliminate the demand for abortions. In no way can a "yes" vote be reasonably characterized as a pro-abortion or anti-life vote.

Indeed, we in Congress are given few such clear opportunities to be so affirmatively and truly pro-life. Vote for this resolution and give the gift of life.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO] a member of the Committee on Appropriations and another champion for international family planning.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, today I am asking my colleagues to support House Joint Resolution 36, which releases funds which support family planning programs all around the world.

This vote is not about supporting abortion. Not \$1 of our family planning funds can be used to perform abortions anywhere in the world. This vote is about preventing abortion. This vote is about improving the health of women and children. This vote is about saving lives. U.S. family planning aid saves the lives of women, and each year around the world 600,000 women die in childbirth.

If we fail to pass this resolution today, family planning and health clinics across the developing world will close. That means that a CARE program giving rural Bolivian women their first-ever pap smears will have to shut its doors. Cervical cancer is curable, but it must be caught early. I am a cancer survivor. I understand the importance of this kind of preventive health care. Women in this region of Bolivia do not have any other health care options. If the family planning clinic closes, more mothers will die from curable diseases such as cervical cancer.

For 30 years the United States has been an international leader in reducing the number of maternal and child deaths through its support for family planning. Today we must renew our commitment to these important priorities. We must keep the promise that was made to the President and release the funds without any qualifications or alterations.

Today's vote does not add more dollars to our family planning budget, but by voting yes to this resolution, we vote to add more days to the life of a poor mother in the Philippines, we vote for fewer unwanted pregnancies in Tajikistan. We vote for fewer abortions across the world.

Support women's health, support children's health, support family health by voting "yes" on this resolution.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. DICKEY], a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. DICKEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the President's resolution on international population control funding, House Joint Resolution 36.

Federal funds, except to save the life of the mother, are prohibited to be used to kill unborn children in our country. We do this because of the millions of children who are killed each year attacks our consciences. It is an attack on our morality. Such killings increase infant mortality. We need to stop this form of infant mortality.

I have had a colleague who stated that we are our brother's keeper. From the same source that he brought that to us it says that how we treat the least of God's creations we treat him. And that is what I am standing here for, is to defend those infants, the defenseless, unprotected infants in that respect and for that reason.

Now, if we do this in our country, we should have no difficulty in doing this for the rest of the globe. Even though they are not American children, unborn children, who are being killed by abortion, they still are children, they are still creations of God. The sanctity of life is what needs protecting.

Americans should not be deceived. This vote on this resolution is not about family planning. This resolution is a manipulative maneuver to try and overturn the 1973 Helms amendment which prohibits the use of foreign aid funds to pay directly for abortions. House Joint Resolution 36 will make an additional \$123 million available for organizations that perform and promote abortions.

Opponents of this resolution, of which I am included, are not against foreign aid to developing countries. We will have a chance to vote on that later. The United States should not be in the business of handing out cash to foreign countries to kill babies to get their population numbers in line.

This is not altruism; this is genocide.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 1/4 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LEVIN], who probably knows more about this issue than any of us in the Congress.

(Mr. LEVIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Chairman, the vote is not about whether we are pro-choice or pro-life on abortion. This vote is whether life for hundreds of thousands of families who choose to plan their families will include a real chance to do so, not whether or not abortion will be available to that family.

Some today will vote for both the privileged resolution and for the Smith resolution. What Mr. SMITH is saying to them is that, without the Smith resolution being part of the law, a vote for the privileged resolution is a vote for spending U.S. dollars on abortion-related activities. That is not—not—correct.

□ 1100

Since 1973, the Helms amendment has prohibited the use of U.S. dollars to perform, support, or encourage abortions overseas, and that mandate has been followed in good faith by the U.S.

Government. Indeed, in order to ensure its implementation, and sensitive to the argument about the fungibility of moneys, when I was assistant administrator of AID, we instituted in the late 1970's a rigorous system to separate out U.S. moneys from other funds spent by organizations receiving American funds.

This practice has been followed assiduously by every administration of AID, as indicated by audits certifying that not \$1 of American funds is being used for abortion-related activities overseas.

Further, the organizations which have received American funds and have been the subject of most controversy, in practice use either no funds from any source or in any case a negligible amount for any programs related to abortion.

So this is the question, really: When the United States is fully abiding by the Helms amendment, when the Government has taken every possible step to separate American funds so no American money is being used for abortion-related activities, and when there is no real fungibility as to U.S. dollars, do we want to stop the availability of critical funds for family planning, for voluntary family planning programs desired by millions of families in fast-growing developing countries?

Mr. Chairman, I urge that the answer for each of us is to vote for the privileged resolution.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN].

(Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the resolution.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the release of international family planning funds on March 1, 1997.

We need to clear up the confusion on this issue and focus on the importance of family planning programs. International family planning programs save the lives of thousands of women and children across the world, prevent unwanted and dangerous pregnancies and reduce the number of abortions worldwide.

Representatives from the Russian Family Planning Association recently shared information on the successes of their program. In this developing country, they are using these valuable dollars to increase access to quality family planning information and services. As a result of this program, contraceptive use has risen from 19 to 24 percent among women in just 4 years. And, between 1990 and 1994, total abortions fell from 3.6 million to 2.8 million.

Yesterday, Secretary Albright testified before our Appropriations Subcommittee. She stated:

Our voluntary family planning programs serve our broader interests by elevating the status of women, reducing the flow of refugees, protecting the environment, and promoting economic growth. As the President has determined, a further delay will cause a



tragic rise in unintended pregnancies, abortions, and maternal and child deaths."

And, let us be clear—support for family planning programs has, to this day, been bipartisan. This program was created in 1969 by President Richard Nixon.

Let me also address some concerns that have been raised by individuals who do not want their tax dollars being used for family planning overseas. Of the two resolutions that we will vote on today, this resolution actually provides less money than does an alternative proposal that will be offered later today.

Finally, let me again reiterate that this is not an abortion issue. Current law prohibits any of these funds from being used for abortion.

I hope that today the House will continue its longstanding and bipartisan support of family planning.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CHABOT], a distinguished member of the Committee on International Relations.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Chairman, the Clinton administration has embarked on what is no less than a worldwide crusade promoting abortion on demand at any time for any reason anywhere. I cannot condemn that policy in words strong enough.

So let me just make a quick point in the short time that I have to speak here this morning. Contrary to what some of those on the other side have said, this vote is indeed about abortion. It has always been about abortion. We simply say to foreign nongovernmental organizations, unless you agree not to perform abortions and not to violate the laws or lobby to change the laws of other countries with respect to abortion, then do not come to this country asking for tax dollars. That is what we are all saying. That is what it is all about.

I have only been in Congress for a little over 2 years now, yet I am voting today for the eighth time on the restoration of the Mexico City policy. A simple, straightforward pro-life policy initiated by President Reagan, carried on by President Bush and eagerly decimated by President Clinton in his first days in office.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that this year the Congress will finally do the right thing and stop the international abortion.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA].

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, this vote is so important, and it is about family planning and it is against abortion. I would say to my colleagues, to reduce abortions we must increase access to family planning. I hear that this is an abortion vote. There is no logic to it. So let me just try to set the Record straight by quoting some statistics.

We know from UNICEF that almost 600,000 women die annually during pregnancy and childbirth, including 75,000 due to unsafe abortions. We know that family planning services will im-

prove the health and the status of women and it will help children.

We know that population experts estimate that the 35-percent cut in our family planning programs has led to an additional 4 million unintended pregnancies and 2 million additional abortions, 2 million additional abortions, as well as 134,000 more infant deaths.

The World Health Organization estimates that 40 percent of unintended pregnancies end in abortion. The World Bank estimates that improved access to family planning can reduce the number of maternal deaths annually by 20 percent. What statistics, and that is only part of it.

We had a group here from Russia, and the testimony we had was that, with United States help in Russia, contraceptive use has increased from 19 to 24 percent between 1990 and 1994, and the abortion rate has dropped 25 percent. That means the number of abortions annually has dropped by 800,000.

So I would submit that if you want to reduce abortions and you want to help children and you want to help families that you vote for this resolution.

Mr. Chairman, I also want to say, we must keep the promise that we made. So I hope that this body will vote for the resolution.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Oregon [Ms. FURSE].

Ms. FURSE. Mr. Chairman, many of my colleagues know of Oregon's Republican Senator Mark Hatfield. He was known and is always known as a man of integrity. He never said anything he did not believe in and he always researched his information, and that is why it is important for Members to hear his words, particularly those who oppose abortion.

In a letter to Representative SMITH, Senator Hatfield said,

I have reviewed the materials you have sent to my office in response to my request that you provide proof that U.S. funds are being spent on abortion. I do not see anything in these materials to back up your assertion.

Senator Hatfield goes on in the letter to say,

Chris, you are contributing to an increase of abortions worldwide because of the funding restrictions you have placed. It is a proven fact that when contraceptive services are not available to women throughout the world, abortion rates increase.

He says, "This is unacceptable to me as one who strongly opposes abortion."

Mr. Chairman, I ask my colleagues to vote for the resolution.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I would say to the gentlewoman that the materials that we provided to Senator Hatfield clearly showed that the organizations were promoting, performing abortions on demand in these developing countries. No one is sug-

gesting that they were doing it with U.S. tax dollars.

The issue here is fungibility. The money that we give to an organization frees up other money that then can be used to lobby for abortion in the developing world. Let me remind everybody in this Chamber that approximately 100 countries around the world protect the lives of their unborn children.

The International Planned Parenthood Federation has made it their mission, their goal explicitly to bring down every one of those pro-life laws. When we give to these organizations, we then empower them to be the super lobby to bring down the laws in Brazil, Peru. Poland recently flip-flopped and went from a pro-life country to a pro-abortion country.

In early February, a new law went into effect in South Africa, again a flip-flop from pro-life to pro-abortion. It is the organizations that are mounting this offensive against the unborn child. When we contribute to them, we are facilitating abortion overseas.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER], the chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Health, Human Services and Labor.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

First, let me say that there is absolutely no abortion issue or no abortion money involved in this debate. I have always been a supporter of the Hyde amendment. I have never supported public funding of abortion in any way. Abortion is not a legitimate family planning method. We outlawed that in 1973. In audit after audit, it has been certified that not one U.S. dollar has gone to fund abortions. Some people believe that there is fungibility, of these funds. The same argument could be used for any health services funded by U.S. money, such as child immunization or family check-up programs. Do we want to end those? Of course not. Continuing a delay in funding will effectively cut U.S. support for voluntary family planning and contraception.

Now, the Smith bill, if it is passed here, in the House is going nowhere in the Senate. Some may feel that by supporting this bill, they are simply saying that they are against abortion for organizations who use their own money for that purpose in countries where it is legal. But, in actual fact, are these people saying no to voluntary family planning, no to maternal and child health in countries that are the poorest on Earth, no to contraceptives and preventing unwanted pregnancies. The truth, unfortunately, Mr. Chairman, is that they will be saying yes, to more abortions, because the voluntary family planning services will not be there that these countries so desperately need.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. ALLEN], a Member of the freshman class.

(Mr. ALLEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of House Resolution 36 in the hope that this House will recognize that international family planning funds are a good investment for America. These funds reduce unintended pregnancies, they reduce the number of maternal and infant deaths, they reduce the number of abortions.

All we are asking is that much-needed funds be released on March 1 instead of July 1. Three months. It seems like a small matter, but it is not. It is not to the women and children around the globe whose lives will be changed by our vote today.

Opponents say this is a vote to fund abortions. That is not true. This resolution preserves the existing ban on the use of Federal funds for abortions overseas. These funds have already been appropriated by this Congress. We seek no additional funds. We ask only that the gap in services not be extended.

As David Broder wrote recently, "The women and children around the world who have the most at stake will not have a vote." We do. We should use it wisely.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. LEWIS], a member of the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to speak in opposition to President Clinton's request for the early release of family planning funds, and I urge my colleagues to instead support H.R. 581.

Let me begin by noting that H.R. 581, the proposal by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. OBERSTAR], and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE], would still allow early release of these funds, but in a much better way. For more than a decade, we had a system regarding family planning funds that worked. H.R. 581 would restore that system.

Under H.R. 581, the organizations receiving these grants must again agree to not perform abortions or undermine the laws of their host countries. I will remind my colleagues that these grants are tax dollars taken from the pockets of hard-working American families. Known as the Mexico City policy, these short set of conditions worked for a decade and was agreed to by all but 2 of the more than 300 agencies which received family planning grants. There were two exceptions: Planned Parenthood Federation of America and the International Planned Parenthood Federation.

Mr. Chairman, the International Planned Parenthood Foundation's official policy statement includes these goals: Advocate for changes in restrictive national laws, policies, practices and traditions, and campaign for policy and legislative changes to remove re-

strictions against safe abortions. The IPPF even advises its affiliates to operate right up to the edge of what is legal and sometimes even beyond.

So today's vote is also a test of whether we respect the sovereignty and customs of these nations. Using American tax dollars to fund organizations overseas that in some manner promote abortions not only horrifies those of us who are pro-life, it should also concern every American taxpayer and those of us in this body who believe we should respect our friends in other nations.

Sending tax dollars taken from our hard-working citizens to groups that promote abortions in foreign nations is wrong in all of these ways. President Clinton dropped the Mexico City policy 4 years ago. I believe it was a mistake, and I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to oppose the President's resolution and support H.R. 581.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. CASTLE].

(Mr. CASTLE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of House Joint Resolution 36.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of House Joint Resolution 36 to approve the Presidential finding regarding international population planning programs. At issue is whether the money will be released on March 1, or whether it will be further delayed by 4 months, until July.

It is my determination that a delay will cause serious irreversible and unavoidable harm. In balance are the lives and the well-being of many thousands of women and children, and American credibility as the leader in family planning programs around the world.

The logic behind delaying the release of the funds as agreed to last year is convoluted to me and many of my colleagues. Wouldn't the delay in support for family planning, even by 4 months, deny safe and effective contraception to couples who depend on these programs? Has it not been documented that we will surely see a rise in unintended pregnancies and maternal deaths, and could we see a return to unsafe and unsanitary methods to terminate those pregnancies?

It seems illogical that those groups and members who oppose the proper release of these funds would indeed believe that we are actually promoting or funding abortion. We are not, and have been prohibited by law since 1973 from doing so. The fact is that a delay in funding will have the exact opposite effect of what those who would restrict these funds would have you believe. The delay in releasing these funds will result in increased abortions, increased overpopulation, and an adverse impact on the environment and our resources.

I urge this body to go about our business of releasing these important family planning funds now, as agreed to in last year's legislation.

□ 1115

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. KELLY].

(Mrs. KELLY asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of House Joint Resolution 36.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the privileged resolution, House Joint Resolution 36 and I ask that all Members do the same. Why? Because the health of women and children worldwide depends on this vote.

At issue here is maternal and infant mortality. International family planning promotes preventive health care, such as prenatal care. It is easy for us to take the availability of health care in the United States for granted, but for sake of this argument we must remember that women and children in developing countries are not so fortunate.

Furthermore, international family planning educates women and their families about sexually transmitted diseases, as well as about the dangers of HIV/AIDS. It is our obligation to humanity to use our financial support and medical knowledge to prevent the spread of these deadly diseases—diseases that often are brought into our own country and threaten our own children.

Some members of Congress will have you believe that international family planning results in abortions, but the truth is that only a lack of family planning can result in such an unfortunate conclusion. Without family planning, we abandon the world's poorest women and force them to rely on abortion as their primary method of birth control.

Let's be clear—current law prohibits the use of any U.S. foreign aid funds for abortion services, including lobbying efforts for abortion, abortion counseling, and the purchase or distribution of commodities for the purpose of inducing abortions as a method of family planning.

Obviously, this vote is not about abortion. It is about health, plain and simple—not misguided and erroneous political statements. Please support this resolution and release the already appropriated international family planning funds on March 1.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], chairman of the Committee on International Relations.

(Mr. GILMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to rise in strong support for the international family planning resolution, House Joint Resolution 36.

Mr. Chairman, at the current rate, the world's population will double from 5.8 to 11 billion people during our lifetime. Excluding China, 21 million of childbearing age in the developing world are added each year, equal to the total number of women of childbearing age in California, Texas, New York, and Florida combined.

President Nixon launched our international family planning program in 1969. That program improves the health of mothers and their children by increasing the time between births while reducing unintended pregnancies and abortion. After 30 years, this program

helped reduce the average number of children in families in the developing world from 6 to 4.

Contraceptive use has climbed from 10 percent to 35 percent, and family planning helps reduce abortion. As contraceptive use in countries such as Russia rose from 19 to 24 percent, abortion rates fell from 109 per thousand women to 76. The population council estimates that without family planning programs, there would have been 500 million more people in the world today, almost twice the population of our own Nation.

If the resolution required by the law is not passed, the Agency for International Development will have to cut vital programs in Mexico, in Haiti, Guatemala, El Salvador, the Dominican Republic, Egypt, Russia, the Ukraine, Jordan, the Philippines, Turkey, Mozambique, Uganda, and Zimbabwe. AID would also have to cut jobs with its contractors in Alabama, Michigan, New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania.

Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

While another bill, H.R. 581, will be offered, House Joint Resolution 36 is the only measure that will be given expedited consideration in the Senate, requiring and ensuring that this vital program can continue to operate.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. SAM FARR], a great environmentalist.

(Mr. FARR of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in these hallowed Halls to remind us that the debate about this money really does not affect us, but it does affect the developing countries of this world.

I have lived in one of those countries. I lived in one of the poorest barrios on earth, without any running water, without any electricity, where the birth rate was an average of 15 children per household. I was a Peace Corps volunteer in Latin America, in one of the most Catholic countries on the earth.

The women in that barrio, I was working with CARE as a Peace Corps volunteer, were requesting every day for information about family planning. They wanted to know about how to raise children and how to have a proper number of children.

I also rise today as a father. I think the learned gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] just pointed out that we are as parents whose children will be growing up in a population that will double in our lifetime, reaching the world's maximum carrying capacity, maximum carrying capacity of this globe.

If we do not provide information, just information to people about how they can properly have children, not too many, we are putting our children into a situation in a globe that is unbearable. We will not be here arguing about

family planning money, we will be here arguing about Fortress America, how we will wall ourselves off from the rest of the world as supplies diminish.

Please support this resolution.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. OBERSTAR], the very distinguished ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Proponents of this resolution have framed the issue as simply a vote on family planning, or a vote about closing family planning clinics overseas. That is not the case. It is a vote on using one-half billion dollars of U.S. taxpayer money to subsidize and to promote abortions, and to promote efforts to overturn legal and cultural barriers in countries overseas and to promote abortion in foreign countries.

The position of this House historically has been a position out of respect to the millions of women and men who in conscience are opposed to abortion, to ensure that our tax dollars do not subsidize or promote abortion.

We have repeatedly demonstrated a willingness to approve funds for family planning, but we have also ensured safeguards against the use of those family planning dollars to promote or encourage in any way or advocate abortion.

In international affairs from 1984 to 1993, 350 foreign organizations signed contracts for U.S. family planning funds, which included restrictions on the use of those funds, against using them for abortion. Only two turned down the funds, because they would not accept the House restrictions on abortion subsidy and abortion promotion.

We should not approve this resolution which will open the door once again for use of U.S. taxpayer dollars to promote abortions overseas.

I have heard the arguments. I have lived in Haiti. I have seen the face of poverty. I have seen the pain in those poor households, if you can call them households; little huts.

I think family planning advice is fair. We should support such activities. But we should not allow U.S. taxpayer dollars to be used to promote abortion, to change the laws of countries that are against abortion. We should be neutral on that issue. That is what the resolution of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] and I will offer subsequent to this action does, is to provide \$713 million, \$170 million more than the bill before us, for international family planning, with the historic House pro-life language.

If all these groups are so committed to instructing women on reproductive freedom, control of futures, control of their family life, then they should be willing to agree that they will not promote abortion.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from

North Carolina (Mr. [PRICE]), a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

(Mr. PRICE of North Carolina asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, this vote presents us with three choices: We can choose between improving and worsening women's health; we can choose between increasing and decreasing child mortality; and we can choose between preventing and causing more abortions.

International family planning programs provide the only medical care many women around the world ever receive. This year those services will help prevent the deaths of as many as 8,000 mothers who die because of the complications in their pregnancies or in childbirth. Family planning services provide health care for children which dramatically increases the chances children will grow up healthy. Having children about 2 years apart in birth date can increase the survival rate by nearly 30 percent.

Finally, preventing abortions. With U.S. funding, family planning programs could prevent as many as 4 million unplanned pregnancies this year, which could prevent up to 1.6 million abortions resulting from those pregnancies. Recent studies clearly link providing family planning services and declining abortion rates in Mexico, Colombia, Hungary, Russia, the Central Asian republics.

Our job today is to sort through the information and the misinformation and all the ideological pressures surrounding this issue, and to do what we were elected to do, to do the right thing. With this vote we can improve women's health, we can improve children's lives, and we can reduce the number of abortions.

Mr. Chairman, there are not too many votes of which we can say that. This is clearly a vote of principle. We must do the right thing. Vote to release the family planning funds.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HOSTETTLER), a member of the Committee on National Security.

Mr. HOSTETTLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this resolution. The Supreme Court has opined in *Roe versus Wade*, and its erroneous prodigy, that we have to allow the killing of preborn children. Clearly, this was a misread of the Constitution by the Court. I think this is a good example of a Court more bent on legislating than on adjudicating; that is, the Court, in *Roe*, was more concerned with setting public policy than in construing the Constitution.

In any event, even the Supreme Court has not opined that our Government has an obligation to provide for or encourage abortion here in America or in any other land. We should not take to this course by our own will. Mr. Chairman, can we really call abortion family planning? Can we really say

that terminating life creates strong families? Can we say that by using taxpayer dollars to finance abortion we are contributing to American interests abroad?

This is not a vote about family planning. This resolution would obligate the U.S. taxpayer to promote abortion services and facilities in foreign lands. It is this obligation that I believe the House should soundly reject. If this resolution passes, there is no question about the President's actions. He will sign it into law.

Before we release any more funds to him for so-called family planning, we must see to it that we do not do so without restrictions at least as solidly respectful of human life as those enjoyed between 1984 and 1993. The sanctity of life transcends international boundaries. It is time to say no to a careless export; that is, the notion that abortion is acceptable as a means of family planning. I urge a "no" vote on this resolution.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SKAGGS], a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Chairman, we have to pass this resolution. I do not care how many times it is repeated, the assertion that this is about making the U.S. taxpayer money available for abortion, to promote abortion, or anything close to it, is simply not true. That is against the law, a law that is strenuously enforced.

Does anyone really believe that the way to have fewer abortions is to have more unwanted pregnancies? All evidence, all logic, is to the contrary. Let us just look at what we have been able to get done in Russia over the last several years, in which there has been roughly a one-quarter decrease in the incidence of abortion, as there has been a one-quarter increase in the availability of funds for contraception and family planning. Does anybody think there is not a connection between the two? The connection between the two has come because of our American family planning assistance program.

Mr. Chairman, fewer pregnancies come from considered family planning decisions made available with these funds and with contraception, fewer pregnancies and fewer abortions. Let us get the logic straight.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. SAM JOHNSON], a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

(Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

□ 1130

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I am strongly opposed to the President's resolution to make millions of taxpayer dollars available for international organizations to promote abortion, in spite of what they are saying.

Frankly, I am disappointed that we are taking the vote on the resolution because of a last-minute compromise in the omnibus appropriations bill. Do you know what, it was a last minute sellout at the expense of the values of the American people. But I am further outraged that the Clinton administration has been doing everything in its power to make sure that the American taxpayer dollars are made available on the international arena for abortions.

There are no monetary differences in these two measures. Both bills release funds earlier than previous. The difference is that one prohibits funding to organizations that perform or promote abortions. The other does not.

The funds are supposed to be spent on international family planning. I cannot believe that anyone in the administration or any Member of this House, for that matter, would list abortion as a method of family planning. We should know that in 1996 the White House administration rejected a compromise which would have provided even more money for international family planning. Why did they reject it? Because it included pro-life language.

I urge this body to stand firm against the funding of abortions overseas and to vote no on this resolution.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. MALONEY], who has worked very hard on this issue.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, everyone knows that family planning is about saving lives, not ending them. Almost 600,000 women die every year because they are having too many children too close together. Not only are women dying, the world population is exploding. By the year 2000, there will be 800 million teenagers on this planet, one-seventh of the entire current world population. That is 800 million people who need family planning information, or the world's population growth will literally affect the survival of the planet.

Again, let me be clear, any family planning is about saving lives. This is not a vote for abortion. It is a means of preventing abortion. While family planning sounds like a domestic issue, its impact is as far-reaching as world peace. Overpopulation leads to unrest.

Recently I met with Ambassador Wisner to India, and I asked him what is the single most important thing we could do to improve relations between our two countries. He said release this family planning money. Women are lined up for days just to receive information. It is an important vote. Vote for family planning.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Kansas [Mr. TIAHRT], a great member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this legislation, House Joint Resolution 36. I rise for a couple of reasons. First, I think it is morally wrong for us to export abortion under

the guise of family planning. We have an option that will come up later, the Smith-Oberstar-Hyde amendment, that will allow us to have actual family planning without exporting abortions. Occasionally the Federal Government is wrong. I think it is wrong to do that.

Second, I think it is improper for us to take tax dollars from Americans, borrowed money. We are still running a deficit, so it is borrowing money from future taxpayers to send overseas to fund abortions. Again, I think the Federal Government is wrong.

If we go back in history and look at the past when we have had incorrect decisions, such as the Dred Scott decision, who of my colleagues in this Chamber would say that that was a correct decision, that African-Americans are not created equal by our Creator. No one. That was an incorrect decision by those representing our Federal Government.

In reading the history of the English-speaking peoples by Winston Churchill, I came across an incident that occurred in Boston about the same time, not long after the Dred Scott decision, where it said a Boston mob attempted to rescue a fugitive slave whose name was Anthony Burns. It took the Federal Government and a battalion of artillery, four platoons of marines, a sheriff's posse and 22 companies of the militia to line the streets so that our Government could return Anthony Burns, a slave, to the South. Who of you here agrees with that Federal decision that we made at that time? It was morally wrong. It was incorrect to take American tax dollars to support the institution of slavery.

Once again, we have a situation where the Federal Government is morally wrong, exporting abortion under the guise of family planning. I think it is very important that we vote against House Joint Resolution 36 because of the morality, because of misusing taxpayer dollars, borrowed dollars that our children will have to pay back. When you borrow a dollar today to export abortion, it takes at least \$3 to pay that dollar back, 3 future dollars that our children have to use to pay back just the interest, let alone the usage and the loss because of inflation. Every dollar. That is also wrong.

So I want to encourage my colleagues to vote against this resolution and to support Smith-Oberstar-Hyde.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN], a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I cannot understand how we as the leaders of the most powerful, prosperous Nation on Earth can vote to deny the poorest people on Earth their ability to control their own lives, to have some hope of one day rising out of the poverty that destroys their dreams and severely limits the lives of their children.

We will leave today for home or for travel, comfortable in the fact that we

have control over our lives. We can express our love for our spouses without the fear that it might cause even more suffering and deprivation of our families and their future. Surely we all understand that overpopulation is the most serious crisis facing the 21st century, that it is the principal cause of child labor, of the sexual exploitation of young girls in Third World countries around the world, of the cheapening of human lives. We can empower these lives, give those destitute mothers reason to dream that there may one day be hope for their children, especially for their daughters.

Not to release these funds is unconscionable when we have the ability to relieve suffering by providing voluntary information, information that will substantially reduce the number of abortions performed and will reduce the exploitation of powerless people. It is our responsibility to know the cause of poverty, to care, and, when we have the ability, to do something responsible about it. This is the right thing to do. Vote to release these funds today.

Mr. Chairman, the question before us today is not whether we should act today to release family planning funds, but whether or not we can conscientiously fail to do so.

I rise today in strong support of the President's resolution to release funds to USAID for international family planning programs. Time and time again, research shows that family planning programs work. The bottom line is that they decrease poverty and improve quality of life for families in developing countries.

We all agree that there should be fewer abortions. This is exactly what the President's proposal accomplishes. Not surprisingly, delaying the release of this money has resulted in an increase in the number of unplanned pregnancies. This will lead to an increase in the number of abortions.

Of the 585,000 maternal deaths which occur each year, 13 percent are attributed to unwanted pregnancy and illegal and unsafe abortions. According to the Population Institution, of the 22,000 children who die every day, many are the result of inadequate family planning, and insufficient time between pregnancies. The tragedy in these deaths is that they can so easily be prevented with the adequate resources to teach men and women how to prevent unwanted and unhealthy pregnancies.

A poignant example of the impacts this delay in funds has had, is seen in Haiti. Haiti is currently in the process of integrating its family planning programs into the CARE, the child health and maternal care program. If we continue to deny release of these funds this program integration will cease. By May of this year, just 3 months away, the nongovernment organizations funded by USAID will be forced to begin laying off workers leaving thousands of Haitian men and women without access to family planning, threatening their health and the health of their children.

Mr. Chairman, let's vote in the only responsible manner we can to release funds for international family planning funds, and against any attempts to apply unnecessary restrictions on their use.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from

Florida [Mr. WELDON], a very distinguished doctor and a member of the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me, and I rise in opposition to House Resolution 36, which is the resolution supported by the President, and urge my colleagues to vote "no" on that and to vote "yes" on House Resolution 581, the resolution introduced by the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

Both of these bills, the bill supported by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] and the one supported by the President, will release funds for family planning. So what is the debate about? It is about one simple issue. Will U.S. tax dollars go to organizations that encourage or provide abortions as a means of birth control? In spite of the rhetoric, this is the issue before us.

To those who support the President's plan, I would ask, why are you against language that says that none of these funds can be used to perform abortions as a means of birth control; do you find abortion an acceptable means of birth control? Why do you oppose language that would stipulate that these funds cannot be used to violate the laws of any foreign country with respect to abortion? Do you support using tax dollars, U.S. tax dollars to subvert the abortion laws of foreign countries?

Those who vote "yes" on President Clinton's bill are voting to give tax dollars to organizations that promote or provide abortion as a means of birth control. Those who vote "no" on President Clinton's bill and "yes" on Mr. SMITH's bill are saying, U.S. tax dollars can go for family planning but they cannot go to organizations that promote abortion as an acceptable means of birth control.

To spend tax dollars on international family planning is an issue for debate. However, taking money out of the pockets of hard-working Americans to pay for abortions overseas is totally unacceptable. Again, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the President's plan and vote "yes" on the plan of [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS].

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Committee on the Budget, I know we are trying to get our country's financial house in order and balance the country's budget. We are also trying to save our trust funds for future and present generations and we are looking to transform the social and corporate and agricultural welfare state into a truly caring opportunity society. I can get really immersed in those issues, but as big as those issues are, they pale in comparison to the fact that one mouth can eat, two mouths can share, four mouths will sometimes go hungry, and eight mouths starve.

In the Book of Psalms, it said I had fainted unless I believed to see the

goodness of the Lord in the land of the living. What kind of world are we seeing; what kind of world is truly living? We have too many people, too many children born into abject poverty, young children living on the streets begging, robbing, stealing, killing, being killed. Young girls and boys sold into sex slavery rings because their parents cannot keep them, they cannot care for them. The rich are getting richer and richer, and the poor are getting poorer and poorer and poorer and poorer and sicker and sicker.

As a Peace Corps volunteer, I know that some countries have grown. Their economies grow but their population outstrips their economies and they are truly becoming poorer. Indigenous Indians in this country said when they looked at the beautiful lake, it was a smile of the Great Spirit. We are losing that smile. I hope and pray we wake up. Release family planning funds now. Allow kids to have a future.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. EDWARDS], a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, I oppose public funding of abortion, but I strongly support House Joint Resolution 36 because this is not about funding abortions. That is prohibited, clearly, in the law. This issue is about saving children. Sadly, there are millions of children across the world that wake up hungry every morning. There are millions more that live at the very edge of survival.

For one moment, just one moment, I wish every parent in this House would imagine how you would feel if you awoke this morning not knowing whether you could feed your child or children. Imagine you lived in a country that had no welfare and there were more people than jobs. For one moment imagine the emotional agony of watching your children crying from hunger or malnutrition. Imagine yourself with just enough money or resources to barely feed the children you love and that you have already brought into this world.

For millions of parents around the world, Mr. Chairman, they do not have to imagine this scenario. It is an everyday reality.

□ 1145

Regardless of the intentions, I think it would be unfair and inhumane to deny family planning services now to those parents who desperately want to feed and nurture the children that they love, just as you and I love our children.

For millions of parents, family planning is the difference between providing adequate care and food for the children they have and facing the desperation of watching all their children go hungry. Today we can make a difference for millions of children.

This issue is about protecting children, children that are struggling to survive and parents that are struggling

to support and nurture those special children. I urge support of the President's resolution.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas, [Mr. PAUL], a distinguished physician and a member of the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

(Mr. PAUL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 36. It is very clear to me that we should be doing nothing in the way of funding international birth control and family planning. If one were to look for the authority for this, it would be very difficult to find it written in the Constitution that that would be a proper function for U.S. taxpayers to be obligated to participate in such a program. So, very clearly, a "no" vote on H.R. 36 would be a correct and proper vote.

I have more problems with the second vote on H.R. 581 because if one is concerned about being a fiscal conservative and following the rules of the Constitution, one might ask how many more dollars of taxpayers' money will be used if H.R. 581 passes? The best answer I can come up with is that instead of the \$215 million that the President would get if he has his way, we would add that and have \$385 million. In contrast, if we did nothing, if we voted down both of these proposals, it is my opinion that then the spending would be limited to \$92 million.

The question arises here, well, what is a couple of dollars doing in some program that is unconstitutional if we can get some language in there that might do some good? Being a strong right-to-life Member, member of the right-to-life caucus, I am very much aware of that and very concerned about it.

Quite frankly, if we did not spend the money we would not be arguing over whether or not the prohibition will do any good. Quite frankly, I do not believe the prohibition language accomplishes what it really intends to accomplish.

For instance, in the wording of this message it is in there that if those who receive the funds do not spend it until the next fiscal year, they would not have the restraints on it. Besides, these organizations so often are international, they are huge in scope, and if they do not use the funds for abortion these funds get shifted around.

Basically, it is very clear to me that the program should not exist. We should vote down the appropriation or keep the appropriation as low as possible. And quadrupling it, from where we are today, if we do nothing, we spend \$92 million; if we pass H.R. 581, with the attempt to try to curtail the abortions, we actually quadruple it.

Quite frankly, I do not believe the language is strong enough to really prevent any of this money getting into the hands of the abortionists.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey, [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN].

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I rise in strong support of the release of international family planning funds on March 1 of this year. We need to clear up the confusion on this issue and focus on the importance of family planning programs.

International family planning programs save the lives of thousands of women and children across the world, prevent unwanted and dangerous pregnancies, and reduce the number of abortions worldwide.

Representatives from the Russian family planning association recently shared information on the successes of their program. In Russia they are using these valuable dollars to increase access to quality family planning information and services. As a result of this program, contraceptive use has risen from 19 to 24 percent among women in just 4 years. And between 1990 and 1994, total abortions fell from 3.6 to 2.8 million.

Yesterday Secretary of State Madeleine Albright testified before our appropriations Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs. She stated:

Our voluntary family planning programs serve our broader interests by elevating the status of women, reducing the flow of refugees, protecting the environment, and promoting economic growth. As the President has determined, a further delay will cause a tragic rise in unintended pregnancies, abortions and maternal and child deaths.

Let us be clear: Support for family planning programs has, to this day, been bipartisan. This program was created in 1969 by President Richard Nixon.

Let me also address some concerns that have been raised by individuals who do not want their tax dollars being used for family planning services overseas. Of the two resolutions that we will vote on today, this resolution actually provides less money than does the alternative proposal that will be offered later.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the very distinguished gentlewoman from Wyoming, Mrs. CUBIN, a member of the Committee on Commerce.

Mrs. CUBIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the resolution on the President's findings on family planning and I ask that my colleagues support the Smith-Hyde bill.

It was stated earlier, and I completely agree, that in the past international family planning has been a bipartisan issue. I suggest to my colleagues that it absolutely remains that way today.

I am pro-life but I am also very much in favor of sex education and birth control and family planning. In my opinion, it is a contradiction to be opposed to abortions and yet be opposed to birth control and family planning, and that is why I support the Smith-Hyde bill. The Smith-Hyde bill supports

international family planning programs in foreign countries, but not like the President's proposal to promote abortions.

I do not believe abortion is nor should it ever be promoted as a method of family planning or for birth control. The Smith-Hyde bill is a bipartisan bill, an alternative approach to the President's shortsighted and irresponsible plan, and it actually increases funding for international family planning even beyond the President's resolution.

Now, let me repeat that. The Smith-Hyde bill will spend more money for international family planning than the President's proposal, and the Smith-Hyde bill will not allow any public money to be spent for abortions.

There are many in this Chamber like me who support family planning programs. This debate is simply not about family planning, but it is a debate about abortion being used as a method of family planning or birth control.

As I said, I am strongly pro-life and I believe that abortion is not acceptable for purposes of sex selection, birth control, or convenience. Frankly, people must begin accepting responsibility for their actions, both domestically and overseas. That is why we must have an honest debate about the use of contraceptives and sex education as responsible methods of family planning. It is time to take the issue of abortion out of the family planning debate.

The resolution on the President's finding ignores this Congress' desire to keep pro-life safeguards in place when providing international family planning funds. Let us send a clear message to the President that we do not want to send taxpayers' money to foreign countries to fund abortions.

I urge my colleagues to vote to permit a rule on a Smith-Oberstar vote and against the resolution supporting the President's finding.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. KENNELLY].

Mrs. KENNELLY of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I wanted to take this moment to thank the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI], for her leadership on this issue, and note that she had to forego going to her dear friend Ambassador Pamela Harriman's funeral, so she could carry out her duties in relation to this program this morning, and I thank the gentlewoman.

Mr. Chairman, I also rise in strong support for this resolution for release of funds for the Nation's international family planning programs.

Make no mistake about it, no matter what we hear on this floor, despite attempts by opponents to say differently, today's vote is about international family planning. More than that, it is a vote to release funds that have already been appropriated to a program that has already been authorized. It is also an agreement we are talking about today that has already been approved by the majority and the minority.

International family planning programs work. They work to promote sustainable development. As Secretary of State Madeleine Albright said just this week, and as the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN] just mentioned, I too was struck by Secretary Albright's words when she noted that these efforts concerning family planning further promote U.S. foreign policy objectives by improving the status of women, reducing the flow of immigration, protecting our environment and, finally, promoting economic growth, which this is very much about.

I would add, too, that these family planning efforts truly do save lives, lives that otherwise might be lost to infection and to starvation, and we have to say it, yes, to abortion. To pretend otherwise is to ignore reality.

I urge my colleagues today, whatever thoughts on other debates where we do disagree, to vote today for the President's resolution.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF], the very distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Transportation of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I rise in very strong opposition to the first resolution and in strong support of the Smith-Oberstar-Hyde resolution.

Second, I want to make clear to people who are listening, I strongly support family planning. I am not one, there may be some who are opposed to family planning, I strongly support family planning and think it is very important.

Third, the Smith-Hyde resolution moves the money out faster and, in some respects, actually more, because by moving it out faster the level is actually higher.

Fourth, I will tell the people that are undecided on this issue there are more than enough groups in this country and in this world who are strong proponents and supporters of family planning who can use not only the money in this bill but double or triple the amount. So there are enough family planning groups that can take the money that are not connected with abortion and are not involved in controversial activities.

We went through the same thing in Romania several years ago when this battle came and the House then sided for family planning but not for family planning groups that are involved in abortion. So I will say that the Smith resolution puts more money out faster, and there are more than enough family planning groups that are strong proponents of family planning who are not involved in abortion, to use the money under Smith-Hyde but to use double that money.

Had my will been done, I would have increased the amount of money for family planning in the Smith-Hyde thing, although we were prohibited from doing that because family planning is important but not family plan-

ning to groups who are connected with abortion, which in many respects in China is one of the most criminal violations of human rights.

□ 1200

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BENTSEN].

(Mr. BENTSEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of releasing the already appropriated funds for family planning on March 1.

With the growing program of overpopulation around the world, access to international family planning is crucial. About 1.3 billion people subsist on \$1 a day, 1.5 billion people lack access to clean drinking water, 120 million people are actively looking for work, and 700 million people are classified as underemployed, working long hours in jobs that often fail to come close to supporting their basic needs. For many of these people, health care is neither affordable nor even available.

It is clearly in our national interest to address these changes and to contribute to international stability and economic growth. It is a more cost effective investment to address these problems proactively rather than later when they erupt into an international crisis.

For health reasons alone, quality family planning deserves our full support. Only through the use of family planning funds have women and couples in poor countries had access to contraceptives, prenatal care, and a link to modern health care services. International family planning has improved women's health and allowed generations of children to grow in safer, more suitable environments.

Mr. Chairman, I insert for the RECORD two articles which appeared in the Houston Chronicle in support of this motion.

[From the Houston (TX) Chronicle, Feb. 7, 1997]

#### CONGRESS SHOULD RELEASE WORLD FAMILY PLANNING FUNDS

Most American couples take for granted their ability to delay starting their families after marriage. They decide when or whether to have more children after a baby's arrival. Or a couple may choose to have no children at all. These are choices that many parents in the developing world do not have.

The link between access to contraception and healthier babies, better educated children wealthier families and population control is a solid one. Recognizing this connection, the United States has a long tradition of providing poor people the world over with the means of controlling the size of their families and appropriately spacing their children. American family planning aid is credited with reducing birth rates in 60 countries and lowering the average number of children per family from six to three.

Now, conservative legislators, persuaded by anti-abortion lobbyists, have tied these highly successful programs to the abortion debate. Charging—mistakenly—during last year's budget debate that U.S. family planning aid helps support abortion services

abroad, abortion opponents cut the programs' funding by 35 percent and mandated that 1997 funds could not be spent until July, nine months into the fiscal year. After that, spending is restricted to only 8 percent per month of the remaining \$385 million allocation.

These funds, by law, cannot be used to provide or promote abortions, and they should be released immediately. Abortion opponents are working at cross purposes here since a lack of contraception undoubtedly will increase unintended pregnancies, which logically could result in an increase in abortions.

Furthermore, the action has hurt family planning programs without regard to a country's position on abortion.

For example, in Trinidad and Tobago, where abortion is illegal, U.S. planning funding has dried up.

Access to reliable contraception and family counseling services act as deterrents to abortion. Meanwhile, poor parents who can direct the destinies of their families have the ability to improve the quality of life for the children they do have. Congress should act now to mitigate the damage that this funding disruption has already caused.

[From the Houston (TX) Chronicle, Jan. 31, 1997]

#### CONGRESS IGNORING SERIOUS POPULATION PROBLEM

(By Werner Fornos)

For those who question that the world has an overpopulation problem—and yes, there are a few—here are a few facts to keep in mind.

1.3 billion people subsist on about one dollar a day. 1.5 billion people lack access to clean drinking water. 120 million people are actively looking for work. 700 million people are classified as underemployed, working long hours, often at back breaking jobs that fail to even come close to meeting their most basic needs.

These facts are just the beginning.

In 1993, some 16.5 million people died from infectious diseases. That was one-third of all deaths worldwide that year, or slightly more than all deaths from cancer and heart disease combined.

A recent report concluded that a resurgence of diseases once thought to have been eradicated stems from a deadly mix of exploding populations, rampant poverty, severe environmental degradation, inadequate health care and misuse of antibiotics.

And still there are skeptics, people who insist that there's no world population problem. Unfortunately, some of those skeptics are in the U.S. Congress, and they have more than little influence. Not enough influence to terminate the U.S. international family planning program, or at least not yet. But, enough to place that program in serious jeopardy.

The 104th Congress last year appropriated \$385 million for population assistance, but the skeptics added a few bizarre twists: None of it can be spent until July 1—nine months into the fiscal year that began last Oct. 1—and then at a rate of 8 percent of the total per month. For the 1997 fiscal year, which ends Sept. 30, this would result in a 76 percent reduction.

That's not exactly the way appropriations are made in Washington. But it clearly indicates that some of our lawmakers with sufficient clout have made up their minds to do away with U.S. population spending overseas.

And that is just about the most untimely notion the national legislature of the last remaining superpower could possibly have. World population is closing in on 5.9 billion



and it is growing at nearly 90 million a year. Virtually all of that growth is in the poorest countries of the world, and it is seriously hampering any reasonable chance many of them will have for emerging from a cycle of poverty, malnutrition, unemployment and social discrimination.

An escape hatch was built into the 1997 international population budget. The President will submit findings to Congress to show that the nine-month moratorium will be harmful to family planning efforts for developing countries. If his findings are accepted by both houses of Congress, the appropriation will be released as early as March 1, rather than July 1.

As this century draws to a close, there is sufficient technology to vastly reduce world population growth. It is possible to insure that world population stabilizes at 8 billion or even less, rather than 12 billion and possibly more.

Virtually every developing country with a problem of rapid population growth recognizes that fact and wants to reduce it. Virtually every industrialized country is trying to do its part to help. But the Congress of the United States, the last remaining superpower has enough recalcitrants to place its present and future overseas population efforts in doubt.

It is a situation the new 105th Congress can correct by voting in February to disperse international family planning funds by March 1. Then the United States can take its rightful place in the forefront of stabilizing world population in helping to lead our global neighbors toward a 21st century of progress, peace and prosperity.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SOUDER], a member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I want to first say, as the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] said, that I believe there is a role for international family planning, and as we look around the world we can see that need.

I strongly have concerns about the fungibility and the maneuverability of funds not only directly but indirectly from fund-raising concerns on abortion, and I have a deep heartfelt concern that American dollars should not be used to kill innocent little children around the world. But also this bill is based on a false premise, and those Members and the general public who are still trying to make up their minds on this bill should realize that Congress has been very generous to international population programs.

Let us get some of the facts straight. The amount the administration already has to spend in fiscal year 1997 in international population programs, even if this resolution does not pass, is over \$400 million. Not \$1 million, not \$10 million, not \$100 million, not \$200 million, over \$400 million.

This is about 25 percent of the entire U.S. budget for developmental assistance to poor countries around the world. It is substantially more than the \$300 million we spend on child survival programs which pay for vaccinations and medicines and save hundreds of thousands of children from dying from easily treatable diseases.

The money we spend on international population control is about twice as

much as the \$200 million we spend on assistance for narcotics control. It is about 4 times the amount we spend for microcredit programs, which empower poor people, mostly women, by allowing them to start small businesses.

In this \$400 million for population control is literally hundreds of times more than we contribute to other urgent needs such as the U.N. Fund for Torture Victims. Yet the administration still tries to make us think that population programs are underfunded.

They do this by constantly pointing to the fact that under the funding compromise adopted last year, only about \$92 million of the fiscal year 1997 population funding can be spent in this fiscal year beginning in July. But they refuse to talk about the additional \$284 million in the carryover funds from fiscal year 1996 which is still available in fiscal year 1997, and they somehow forget to mention the additional \$43 million Congress has appropriated for contributions to the U.N. Population Fund.

Mr. Chairman, this is a total of \$420 million. If we reject this resolution, the total stays at \$420 million. Population programs will still have one of their best years in history. Not only is a no vote on the Clinton resolution the right vote for those who respect life, it is also the only vote consistent with fiscal responsibility and a balance of priorities and how we approach international funding.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCGOVERN], a member of the freshman class.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Chairman, throughout my district in Massachusetts, I have spoken out quite clearly that one of my top priorities is protecting the health and the lives of children, mothers, and pregnant women. But, Mr. Chairman, my concern for the health of women and children does not stop at the borders of my district. It extends to all women and all children around the globe.

Over the past 30 years, U.S. support for international family planning has been one of the great success stories of our development programs. What do U.S. international family planning programs do? They protect the health, welfare, and survival of women and children. They reduce the spread of sexually transmitted diseases like HIV/AIDS. They reduce poverty. They reduce the pressure of human population on the environment. And they dramatically reduce the rate of abortion worldwide.

Mr. Chairman, the cuts and delays in releasing current U.S. funds have already caused harm to many of these programs. I urge all my colleagues to support the President's finding and to release these desperately needed funds now.

Mr. Chairman, USAID international family planning programs have earned the support and respect from a broad spectrum of U.S. and international nongovernmental organiza-

tions [NGOs], along with such international agencies as UNICEF.

The NGOs represent a diverse array of interests, such as religious institutions, environmental groups, population and development organizations, legal and educational associations, and women's and children's advocates. From the National Audubon Society to the Religious Action Center on Reformed Judaism, from CARE to the Emory University School of Public Health, all have urged the release of these already appropriated USAID funds for international family planning.

The issues that bring together such an annual coalition of interests reflect how successful U.S. international family planning programs have been over the past three decades. It also reflects how very real is the harm to women's and children's lives that has already been caused by recent cuts in funding levels and the current delay in releasing appropriated moneys for these programs.

For example, in Bolivia, a CARE program designed to give rural Bolivian women access to pap smears for the first time ever will be terminated if funding is delayed any further. When diagnosed early, cervical cancer can usually be treated effectively. Bolivia is plagued with the highest maternal mortality rate of any country in Latin America. Without the benefits of early detection through pap smears, rates of women's deaths in Bolivia will likely remain high.

In the Philippines, the USAID program in natural family planning, which is carried out by the Georgetown University Institute for Reproductive Health, would come to an abrupt halt in the Philippines. Because the contract is up for renewal in June 1997, the funding delay would close this project down completely.

In Zambia, more than 100,000 women in Lusaka, Zambia's capital, receive family planning support through USAID. Should funding be delayed to this project, key reproductive health care training will be scaled back dramatically, meaning that condom distribution in this country will be reduced significantly. As a result, hundreds of new HIV cases will occur in this urban capital that already suffers from a high HIV infection rate. The cutbacks in service training will also cause thousands of couples to lose family planning information services. This in turn will increase the incidence of unwanted pregnancies and ultimately abortions in Zambia. Sadly, unsafe abortion has been among the top causes of hospital admission in Lusaka.

As these cases only begin to illustrate, family planning programs are truly development success stories. And by making widespread the use of contraceptives, they are also one of the most successful means of reducing abortion rates worldwide. Indeed, making family services available to all who want them should be the common ground on which both sides of the abortion debate can agree.

Mr. Chairman, I include for the RECORD the following two attachments from the U.S. Agency for International Development, dated January 31, 1997, which outline some of the impacts of the fiscal year 1997 funding delay on specific country programs.

#### THE IMPACT OF THE FISCAL YEAR 1997 FUNDING DELAY ON COUNTRY PROGRAMS

The following country programs are among those that would be most severely affected by not being able to receive FY97 population funds until July 1 or later:

Bolivia—Defer ongoing population assistance to the National Social Security Medical System, jeopardizing services to 20 percent of Bolivia's population. Reduce support to local organizations providing family planning services to 30 percent of Bolivia's rural population.

Haiti—Layoff staff of NGOs serving thousands of poor Haitian couples. Delay and possibly cancel integration of family planning into CARE's maternal and child health care program.

Mexico—Curtail USAID-funded training of family planning service providers in the public sector and potentially close some NGO clinics, including in Chiapas, one of Mexico's poorest states.

Guatemala—Reduce services of largest private family planning provider and close rural health promoter program.

El Salvador—Continue cutbacks and downgrading of services of the leading NGO family planning provider.

Dominican Republic—Reduce services of leading NGO family planning providers and lose opportunities for initiatives to increase male involvement in family planning.

Russia—Suspend funding for two of the largest organizations providing assistance, jeopardizing programs to train family planning service providers and provide 1.7 million couples with access to modern family planning services as an alternative to abortion.

Ukraine—Suspend planned extension to major cities of training for service providers in clinical reproductive health, contraceptive counseling and prevention of sexually transmitted diseases.

The Philippines—Defer a number of programs to train health personnel in natural family planning, introduce voluntary surgical contraception at 200 sites, and work with the commercial sector on provision of oral contraceptives.

Egypt—Suspend USAID's principal mechanism to provide technical and financial support for the national family planning program, a disruption that would affect thousands of clients now served.

Jordan—Suspend establishment of model family planning centers and information campaigns on availability of family planning, affecting 500,000 couples who are current and expected users.

Turkey—Suspend training of nurses and midwives, increasing the shortage of trained providers of family planning and related health services.

Mozambique—Reduce training and other family planning service delivery activities in four focus provinces with a combined population of over 6 million.

Uganda—Suspend or curtail a number of training and family planning service delivery programs.

Zimbabwe—Suspend deliveries of USAID-funded contraceptives, resulting in stock-outs for clinics and community-based distributors.

#### THE IMPACT OF THE FISCAL YEAR 1997 FUNDING DELAY ON USAID TECHNICAL LEADERSHIP THROUGH WORLDWIDE PROGRAMS

The following worldwide programs are among those that would be most severely affected if FY97 population funding is not available until July 1 or later:

Service delivery—Critical service delivery programs supported through US-based private voluntary organizations (PVOs), including CARE, Pathfinder International, and AVSC, would have to suspend or even shut down key activities. AVSC, for example, would shut 70 percent of the family planning service sites it supports in Nepal.

Natural family planning—USAID's planned new agreement with Georgetown University

could not begin soon enough to prevent suspension of programs serving over 700,000 annually, including in Bolivia, the Philippines, and Ecuador.

Contraceptive supplies—There could be serious contraceptive shortages in a number of countries in FY98—Up to 50 million condom, 4.8 million cycles of oral pills, and 500,000 intra-uterine devices (IUDs)—as well as loss of U.S. jobs.

Training—Training of over 4,500 family planning service providers in 10 or more countries would be deferred indefinitely.

Information and communications—Information campaigns on family planning and maternal and child health designed to reach millions of couples in Bolivia, Ukraine, the Philippines, Kenya, and other countries would be slowed.

Research—Initiation of a large-scale clinical trial for a new female-controlled barrier method would be deferred, and work on other current contraceptive leads would be slowed, delaying introduction of new and improved methods.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the Rockefeller Foundation recently published this report. It is called *High Stakes: The United States Global Population and Our Common Future*. It is important that we consider what the stakes are in this debate because the stakes are indeed high.

Mr. Chairman, the stakes are about women dying. They are about mothers dying. Every day 1,600 women die of pregnancy-related causes because they do not have access to reproductive health services, including family planning. Around the world, 250 women will die for lack of family planning services during the course of this debate; 585,000 women die for these reasons every year around the world.

What they die of is called most frequently postpartum hemorrhage. It happens most frequently when poor women have undergone many closely spaced births, and when these women die, they die because when they have their pregnancies they are too young, they are too old, their children come too closely together or they have too many children, and when they die they leave behind vulnerable orphans.

It is indeed a tragedy. The stakes are about children dying. Every year 7 million infants die on this planet because their mothers were not healthy enough for their pregnancies, or they lacked obstetric care, when the children most likely to die are those children who are born too closely spaced together, into families that are too poor and to women who lack access to family planning services.

We have heard a lot of talk this morning in this debate about abortion, and speaker after speaker on the other side of this debate have walked to the podium and talked about this program as if it enhances the number of abortions in the world. Nothing, nothing, could be further from the truth. Each year in this world 50 million women have abortions performed; 20 million of

those abortions are in unsafe conditions.

Mr. Chairman, when I decided to speak out on this issue, I felt I needed to understand how this program works and to see it operating on the ground. A few weeks ago I traveled to La Paz, Bolivia, a country in which abortion has never been legal and a country until just recently, because of this program, family planning services were not available at all. I went into the Andean Mountains and I met with the Aymara Indians and I met with them in little clinics and little hospitals around the country, and I spoke to them about their efforts to go out and talk to their neighbors, door to door, using these funds, meager funds, to promote family planning services.

What I found out is that just 8 years ago, the health ministry of Bolivia did a survey for health planning purposes. They did not have in mind a study about abortion or family planning services. They just wanted to know how their hospitals were being utilized. What they discovered, to everyone's amazement, is that 50 percent, half, of the beds in the country, the poorest country in the Western Hemisphere next to Haiti, in Bolivia, 50 percent of the beds were occupied by women who were suffering the results of botched and illegal abortions.

Abortion is not legal there. What has changed that, what has reduced the number of abortions in poor countries like Bolivia and in poor countries all over the world has been this program. This family planning program is what reduces abortions. And not one penny, let us say this over and over again, not one penny, not one dime of these funds are used to perform abortions, to counsel that abortion is an option, to promote abortion, not one penny of this money is used for that.

In those few instances where these funds are provided to an organization, a hospital, a government organization, a nongovernment organization that does exist and operate in a country where abortion is legal, these funds are strictly segregated. These organizations sign contracts that they will use none of this money for abortion-related services, and, in fact, they do not. We are here to prevent abortions.

We can define our interest in this issue in terms of the humanitarian issues I have just talked about, women dying and children dying and preventing abortion, or we can think of our more narrow national interest, the interest of the United States.

It took 10,000 generations for the world's population to reach 2 billion, and that happened just about when I was born, in 1950. Yet in the second half of this century, the population has increased from 2 billion to 5.5 billion. Look where it is headed. It is headed above 10 billion world population by midway through the next century.

The population in the industrialized countries has stabilized. But in countries that are underdeveloped, and the

poorest nations, India, Bangladesh, sub-Saharan Africa, the Middle East, Mexico, the population is exploding and it is exploding out of control.

Unsustainable population growth leads to increased demands for energy, and in the Third World that energy is produced by burning coal, dirty coal. Our scientists are clear about the fact that world population explosion means much more greenhouse gases being distributed to the atmosphere, it means global warming. Unchecked population growth in the Third World means depletion of water resources. It means famine, it means suffering. It pushes populations to clear rain forests. It pushes populations to go out and graze on land that cannot sustain cattle, and that leads to expansion of the deserts worldwide.

We all have a stake in the global environment.

When population explosion results in crushing poverty, people will work for next to nothing. What this chart illustrates is the growth in job seekers, the labor force in the industrialized countries, which is relatively stable, versus developing countries. What you see is an exponential growth rate in countries that are undeveloped and non-industrialized. And so what happens?

What happens is what we have seen happen in the last decade or two. American workers are competing to produce products that are made overseas by people who will work for 25 cents a day or a dollar a day, and we cannot compete for those jobs. So in our very, very self-interest, for the workers of this country, for the future workers of this country, it is our job to prevent this great economic leveler, population explosion, from making us economically uncompetitive.

When the local economies cannot provide jobs, poor people migrate. They migrate to the industrial nations. Legal and illegal migration to this country is coming from Latin America, Asia, and Africa. Whether we define our interests as humanitarians committed to saving women and children from dying, or whether we define them more narrowly as protecting our Nation from global environmental degradation and job loss from a wave of migration, legal and illegal, this resolution is the right thing to do.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support it.

□ 1215

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds in order to commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GREENWOOD] for his very comprehensive statement, indeed a definitive statement, on what is at stake here on the floor today. It is about family planning, it is about the individual lives of poor women and children and families throughout the world, it is about population and our environment, it is about the economies of the world, and I commend the gentleman for his courageous leadership and on his clear presentation for us.

I wanted to make a couple comments about what I have heard—is my time up?

Mr. Chairman, I will have to seek more time, but first I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. OLVER], a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI] for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the President's recommendation to release the already appropriated international family planning funds. Mr. Chairman, America's family planning program reduces unintended pregnancies in developing countries; 40 percent of those unintended pregnancies end in abortion. So, crippling our family planning program clearly leads to more abortions.

America's family planning dollars help poor women to protect themselves from deadly disease, to regulate childbearing when they want to do so. So indeed the release of these funds saves the lives of women and children. But this decision is about more, because unchecked global population growth affects all us in many ways.

Population pressures cause irreparable environmental degradation in fragile areas, and the growing numbers of the unemployed in developing nations threaten the economic and political stability of the entire globe.

So I urge my colleagues in the House to vote for the President's resolution to release the funds on March 1.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia [Ms. NORTON] who is co-chair of the Congressional Caucus on Women's Issues.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, progress in family planning is one of the great success stories of the world. It is where we are making progress throughout the developing world. I am proud of the role my country has played in this progress. This is one of the bright stars of American foreign policy.

I respect the conscientious and religious objections of those who oppose abortion, but I cannot imagine what the world thinks of this debate that drags abortion into a family planning matter. We must not see abortion in issues that allow us to cut off our noses to spite our faces. Family planning and contraception in the developing world impact three issues of awesome importance: maternal health, children's health and AIDS.

In the early century, graveyards showed more women dying at an earlier age than men. We have turned that around almost exclusively because of family planning. Let us do for the world what we have done for our country. Let this money go.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on For-

eign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs, the very distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN].

(Mr. CALLAHAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] for yielding this time to me.

I had decided that I would not come to the microphone today to speak on this issue. This is an issue that has been cast upon my subcommittee, that is not an entitlement of ours. It is the responsibility of the Committee on International Relations to handle this issue. But in the absence of a bill being passed through the House and through the Senate and signed by the President, it has become the responsibility of my subcommittee to handle it.

Last year during the process, we went to great lengths to try to compromise, which is what this body is all about, a body of compromise. I am pro-life, and I do not apologize for that. But at the same time I recognized what the pro-choice people were talking about.

In an attempt to make this issue go away, to make it fair, to give both sides a half-full glass, we adopted what was perceived as the Callahan amendment, and I spoke to many of my colleagues about this, and I even took the liberty of calling to my office with the assistance of a former Member of ours, Charlie Wilson, the leaders of the family planning community.

Mr. Chairman, they could not find one thing wrong with the Callahan amendment and they would not accept it because the right-to-life side had accepted it. Had they accepted it, they would have more money available, not for abortions, but for family planning. But they did not want to accept it because of the fact that the other side did accept it. That is the only reason they ever gave, the only logical explanation.

So in a desperate attempt, I talked with Secretary of State Christopher, and he agreed that it sounded fair to him. But nevertheless, the President sent messages that he was going to veto the entire foreign operations bill if the language we had proposed was in there.

So I put in a call to the President of the United States to ask for the opportunity to come to him and ask him to find one thing that was wrong with it. And the President, whereas in the past when he needed me, on situations like Bosnia, on situations like Haiti, when he summoned me to the White House and begged for my support and I ultimately gave it to him, refused to return my call.

And as a result of my inability to explain to the President to remove his veto threat and solve this issue for a long period of time, and to provide funding for family planning and at the same time to recognize the rights of the unborn, we are here today.

So we reconstructed the language at the insistence of Mr. Panetta, even though Mr. Panetta agreed that maybe I was right. But in order to allow the government to continue to operate in order to get the Government running and pass the bill that we had to pass, we agreed to this, knowing it would come back.

So as a result of that, I intend to vote "no" on the request of the President, and I intend to vote "yes" on the Chris Smith amendment.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SAWYER].

(Mr. SAWYER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the measure before us.

Rapid population growth and movement are the primary causes of worldwide environmental degradation, dwindling natural resources, urban poverty, malnutrition, and social unrest that in too many cases leads directly to conflict approaching the level of war. At the same time, more than 90 percent of the annual population increase of 100 million people is in the developing world.

This debate is really about giving the people of the world the information and resources that Americans take for granted. As the Houston Chronicle has pointed out, most Americans make responsible and informed choices about when and whether to have children. These are choices that many parents in the developing world do not realize they have.

The number of people added to the world's population each year is increasing, especially in the world's poorest countries that are least equipped to deal with this growth. It is in our national interest and in the global interest to support voluntary international family planning. Efforts to slow population growth, elevate the status of women, reduce poverty, and promote sustainable development will lead to a more stable world.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman I yield myself 1½ minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I would just like to make some points of clarification because I think there is some confusion among Members about certain points.

Let me make it clear the President's resolution does not subsidize, promote, allow, perform, or in any way condone abortion.

Second of all, there is no more money in the Smith resolution. The money is the same in the Smith resolution as it is in the President's proposal. The money is the same.

Third of all, I once again want to call to our colleagues' attention that all I have said first about this resolution not promoting or having anything to do with abortion is a matter of U.S. law according to the Helms amendment.

I have the provisions for our colleagues to see, blown up on a bulletin

board or in handouts, on the very statutes; and also I have for them the safeguards to prove and demonstrate how this law is implemented.

In closing I want to say one thing, and I say this with the greatest respect for the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN], the chair of our subcommittee on which I am ranking. The President has acted in good faith on this issue. He entered into an agreement, he entered into an agreement which called for less money, delayed the funding, in order to be able to have this House vote at this time up or down, to accept his certification that this delay in funding, et cetera, was a hindrance to promoting our international family planning goals.

In further proof of the President's good faith, I call to our attention a statement by the President in May 1996 where he accepted the Congress' request to strike from legislation, provisions that would have allowed the President to go forth with this spending with his own certification and without a vote of Congress. Congress said, we put that in by mistake; the President said, okay, I will take it out and then we will proceed.

So I urge our colleagues to look carefully at these provisions which safeguard any ideals that they have about abortion, but also uphold our principle of promoting family planning internationally.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of our time to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL], whose credentials are unsurpassed in the area of child survival. He truly lives and acts by the words of the gospel of Matthew, rendering to the least of our brethren as if he were rendering to God.

(Mr. HALL of Ohio asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI] for yielding this time to me and for her very kind remarks.

There is probably nobody more pro-life in the Democratic Party than I am. If my voting record is not 100 percent, then it has got to be pretty close. I was the author of the conscience clause on abortion which was included in the Democratic platform, and I spoke of that issue at the convention.

I feel myself in a position today that is unusual for me, for I find myself opposing the views of the pro-life position. I support Mexico City policy, but I believe that the pro-life forces have gone too far in their effort to make the release of funds a pro-life issue, and this vote would hurt millions of women and children. Because of massive cuts to international family planning and very restrictive language that has held up other funds related to it, the pro-life forces have caused great damage, in my opinion, to poor communities all over the world.

I am for family planning, which is prenatal care and education to women,

and breast-feeding and proper nutrition, and spacing of children and other child survival activities. I am against abortion. And there is a difference between family planning and abortion, but sometimes around here we do not separate the two of them from the discussion.

In quoting a letter from CARE and Save the Children, they have again stated current law, and I quote: "In keeping with the Helms amendment, no U.S. funds are used to pay for abortion, nor do our organizations use private money to pay for abortions." That is the law and has been for some time.

World Vision, an organization that I have great respect for, is for releasing these funds. World Vision is a Christian organization, and they are pro-life.

□ 1230

I have traveled with them in many parts of the world to visit the poor, I have seen their work, and I have always been very inspired. When they speak on this issue, I listen.

Along with CARE, Save the Children, World Vision, they wrote many of us, and I am quoting from a letter that they wrote to me:

Based upon our knowledge and operational experience, we can assure you that this is not an ideological or partisan issue, but a serious health concern for women, children and families. In addition to more maternal and child deaths, reduced access to family planning services will result in more unintended pregnancies, leading to more, rather than fewer, abortions. By voting to release already limited family planning funds, you will be voting to prevent more of these tragedies from happening.

I agree with them. In our effort to legislate around here, sometimes we become extreme and we become purists, and we hurt the people we are trying to help. This should not be an issue between pro-choice and pro-life forces. Rather, this is an issue of justice and fairness, in my opinion. Vote "yes" on this resolution.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, if I could inquire, am I correct that there is no more time other than the time that remains to my side?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana has 12 minutes remaining; the gentlewoman from California has yielded the balance of her time to the gentleman from Ohio, and that time has expired, so the gentleman from Louisiana has 12 minutes remaining.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I yield to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, could I inquire, do we have any more time left?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair was in error. The gentlewoman from California has 30 seconds remaining and the gentleman from Louisiana has 12 minutes remaining.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the right to close and would certainly ask the gentlewoman to expend her time.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL] for his leadership and for his fine statement from the heart and from the head to our colleagues. I want to thank Members on both sides of the aisle for what I believe is the fine tenor of the debate today.

International family planning is an issue of grave importance, and once again I appeal to our colleagues not to hold the poor children of the world hostage to the politics of the House of Representatives. Let us take a step forward and vote "yes" on the privileged resolution and approve the President's findings regarding international family planning.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume. In sharing the expression by the gentlewoman from California about the tenor of the debate, I think it has been a fine debate.

Mr. Chairman, I am happy to yield the balance of my time to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], a member of the Committee on International Relations and an outstanding expert on this issue.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank my very good friend [Mr. LIVINGSTON], the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, just to respond briefly, nobody is holding any funds or money hostage. This is all about fundamental human rights and protecting the precious unborn children while simultaneously providing family planning.

Mr. Chairman, I want to make it very clear that the House will today consider two diametrically opposed pieces of legislation on family planning. While each is designed to release fiscal year 1997 family planning funds by March 1, that is where the similarity ends.

The Clinton resolution, introduced by request by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY]—and I would note for the RECORD that Mr. ARMEY does not support the resolution—is strongly pro-abortion in its effect. Make no mistake about it, the consequence of approving the Clinton resolution is a fat payday for abortion providers. So please be fully aware of the unavoidable fact that if you vote for House Joint Resolution 36, you further empower, strengthen, and tangibly aid and abet the abortion industry overseas.

Know that a "yes" vote on House Joint Resolution 36 pours hundreds of millions of U.S. taxpayer dollars into organizations that have made the toppling of pro-life laws and policies in the developing countries their mission and their explicit goal. And know that once that they have succeeded in overturning those laws that protect the unborn child, once they have eviscerated the constitutional protections that are currently in place, these are the same folks who jump in with both feet to set up the abortion mills.

Who we subsidize, Mr. Chairman, not just what we subsidize, but who we subsidize does matter. It should matter greatly to each of us not just what an organization does with our specific donation, but the rest of their agenda as well. It is a package deal. This is especially important because money is fungible. What we give to a group immediately frees up other non-U.S. funds that can be used and in this case are used for performing and aggressively promoting abortion.

In recent months the Clinton administration has said that it does not promote abortion overseas. Oh, if that were only true. During Mr. Clinton's first term, my colleagues know and I know that his office pushed hard for an international right to abortion. At the 1994 U.N. Population Conference in Cairo, and especially at the preparatory meetings, known as PrepComs, leading up to the conference, the administration mounted a full court press for an international right to abortion.

A State Department March 1994 action cable sent to every U.S. ambassador and mission abroad prior to that meeting instructed our envoys to lobby their host governments with these instructions:

The United States believes that access to abortion is a fundamental right. The United States delegation will be working for stronger language on the importance of access to abortion services overseas.

In a speech at the second PrepCom for the Cairo Conference, Tim Wirth said much the same thing, how they were going to be pushing abortion. And in a keynote address at the 1994 meeting of the Population Cooperating Agencies, Brian Atwood, the administrator of AID, said, and I quote,

While obstacles cannot be removed overnight, this administration will continue to stand for the principle of reproductive choice, including access to abortion.

I say to my colleagues of the House, those so-called obstacles that Mr. Atwood was referring to are right-to-life laws and constitutional provisions that protect unborn children in approximately 100 countries in the developing world. Virtually all of Central and South America protect their kids from abortion. These are construed by the administration to be obstacles.

These abortion power plays, these overt pro-abortion initiatives, so far have been largely repudiated by the developing world, but they have had some successes. Poland and South Africa recently flip-flopped and went from pro-life to pro-abortion. So there is now a dual strategy: When the overt strategy failed, another strategy was employed.

For the last 4 years the administration has relied on a parallel track, a more sophisticated covert means designed to accomplish that end. They have used surrogates, nongovernmental organizations like the International Planned Parenthood Federation based in London, and the Pathfinder Fund and others to do the lion's share of the

dirty work to nullify pro-life laws and to set up abortion mills the world over.

This past Tuesday I asked our very distinguished Secretary of State, Madeleine Albright, an official for whom I have great respect, whether she was aware of the 1992 International Planned Parenthood Federation abortion manifesto called Vision 2000, a global strategic plan that Planned Parenthood adopted and have been implementing ever since to promote abortion in every corner of the world. The Secretary, known for her candor, admitted she never heard of it.

IPPF, by the way, has received more than \$70 million from the U.S. taxpayers, courtesy of this administration, so it seems to me that the Secretary of State and all of us should know what IPPF is all about. Again, it is not just what they do with "our" money, it is what their agenda is all about.

I urge Members to look at this document. This is their marching orders in the developing world. Do not just say our money is not going to be used. Other money then gets used to bring down these right-to-life laws. Let me just quote briefly from it.

The Vision 2000 strategic plan says, and I quote, that they will "bring pressure on governments and campaign for policy and legislative change to remove restrictions against abortion." Can anything be more clear? Pressure governments. Campaign for abortion on demand. And we are providing many, many millions of dollars to this group.

Fred Sai, who is the former chairman of International Planned Parenthood, put it very succinctly when they passed this IPPF strategic plan. He said,

Now, for the first time, the IPPF strategic plan, Vision 2000, which was unanimously adopted at the Members' Assembly in Delhi, outlines activities at both the Secretariat and FPA level to further IPPF's explicit goal of increasing the right of access to abortion.

Who we support and subsidize does matter.

IPPF has an elaborate plan and plans of action, as they call them, to promote abortion in every country of the world, including Central and South America where, again, they protect their unborn children. They have plans to decimate the pro-life laws in Africa, the Muslim countries in the Middle East, and several Asian countries who also legally protect their children from the abortionist's knife.

A vote for the Clinton resolution empowers the abortion industry to continue and expand these efforts to eradicate pro-life laws. Eliminate a law in Poland and a whole generation of kids are put at risk. Eliminate a law that protects them in South Africa or any other country, and an entire generation of kids are put at risk of abortion on demand.

I would respectfully submit that the only responsible pro-life action today is a "no" vote on the Clinton resolution and a "yes" vote on H.R. 581, the Smith-Oberstar-Hyde bill.

I truly believe that if we stand on the human rights principle of safeguarding human life today, the administration will ultimately do the right thing, provide family planning money, but do so with pro-life safeguards.

I was very encouraged by the statement made this past December by Phyllis Oakley, assistant secretary for population, when she appeared before my subcommittee. I chair the International Operations and Human Rights Subcommittee. Secretary Oakley, who is the point person for population for the administration said, and I quote:

The United States does not promote abortion and does not support the performance of abortion." She said, "That is clear. We have stated it over and over again. I can assure you that remains our fundamental policy.

I therefore respectfully submit that the competing resolutions before the House today put Secretary Oakley's statement concerning this fundamental policy to the test. If the administration persists in promoting abortion by way of surrogates, the Clinton denials of promoting abortion will be exposed as wholly disingenuous and untrue.

Mr. Chairman, I urge a "yes" vote on H.R. 581 as introduced by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. OBERSTAR] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE] and myself. This pro-life, pro-family planning bill releases the entire \$385 million appropriated for fiscal year 1997 on March 1 for family planning, but, again, it does it with the pro-life safeguards.

As a matter of fact, in fiscal year 1997 the administration will have significantly more to spend on family planning with our bill, not with the bill before you or the resolution, but with our bill.

Total cash on hand for population in fiscal year 1997, as this chart shows you, with carryover funds from 1996, will be \$713 million with our bill. It will be only \$543 million with the Clinton resolution. That is clear; that is undeniable. Yes, the money will be spent eventually, but the issue that the Clinton administration is making is that money delayed is money denied. We will frontload the whole thing, giving you the entire pot of money for family planning, but do so with pro-life safeguards.

I think it is very, very significant for Members to know that these safeguards are nothing new; they were in effect. People have talked about the Helms amendment today. The Helms amendment in the 1980's was found to be infirm. Yes, it stopped direct funding, but there were loopholes. The pro-abortion groups simply took their own money, which was freed up by our contributions, and used it for abortion promotion.

Let me just again say that the pro-life safeguards of the Mexico City policy were in effect during the Reagan and Bush years as a way to fully fund family planning without promoting abortion. The Mexico City policy is both pro-family planning—and we make it clear in our bill—and pro-life.

Specifically, the safeguards say this: We will condition funds only to those organizations that will not perform abortions except in the cases of rape, incest, and life of the mother. We restrict funds to those organizations that will not lobby, that will not become the network in Peru or Brazil or any of these other countries bringing down their pro-life laws.

□ 1245

Mr. Chairman, they are extensions of U.S. foreign policy. We give money to them. When they are talking to a legislator in one of these countries they do not say, "Are you doing that with U.S. money or are you doing that with your own money?" They are an extension of our policy. Since we are the megacontributors and donors to them, what they do reflects directly upon us here in the United States.

If Members want to promote abortions, say it. This Mexico City policy makes it very clear that there ought to be a wall of separation between the two.

Let me also point out that during the years that the policy was in place, in excess of 350 family planning organizations, including Planned Parenthood affiliates in 57 States or countries, accepted the conditions. Some of the more extreme pro-abortionists in IPPF went ballistic over that, and even censured IPPF Western Hemisphere for doing that. But I believe they showed that they wanted to do family planning. They did not want to be part of this big push for abortion. Vote "no" on the Clinton resolution, and please vote "yes" on H.R. 581.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT].

(Mr. GEPHARDT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Chairman, the world's population is growing by 90 million every year—that is the equivalent of adding the entire population of Mexico every year. Family planning is critical for the survival of the planet and the people on it. Overpopulation leads to the suffering of women and innocent children, poverty, and war.

There is an unfortunate tendency in this country to reduce important debates concerning reproductive issues to the labels "pro-choice" and "pro-life." We will ill serve the citizens of this country and the world if we allow this vote today to fall victim to these labels.

First, there is evidence that without family planning, the number of abortions increases.

And second, today what we are really doing is voting to ensure that there will continue to be humane and responsible efforts through voluntary family planning services so that the people who live on this planet can live with decency and dignity.

The United States has a moral obligation to lead the effort to control population responsibly. And I believe, therefore, that the moral vote today is a vote for the President's resolution.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LEWIS].

(Mr. LEWIS of Georgia asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I want to add my voice to those that have spoken today in support of international family planning.

Mr. Chairman, there is no question that funding for family planning has promoted the health and survival of women and children in developing nations. The United States has taken a leading role in promoting child survival in the world, decreasing maternal and infant mortality, and ending the spread of deadly disease, including the AIDS virus. And, yes, Mr. Speaker, we have helped reduce the practice of abortion through this program. Today, abortion is widespread in many nations—Russian women have on average 7 to 8 abortions in a lifetime. Family planning is helping to reverse this epidemic—to end the trend, not to begin it.

We have heard it said on this floor today, and I will say it again: not one penny of family planning aid goes to support abortions. Not one penny. This vote is not about supporting abortions abroad—it is about ending them. It is about about saving the lives of women and children. It is about saving the lives of women who, in many cases, are children.

Family planning is helping to end the spread of the AIDS disease—a disease who know no borders. It is helping couples in developing nations reduce the size of their families so they can stay out of poverty, become educated, survive, and thrive. Family planning has limited the number of births in the developing world on average from 6 to 3.

And to my colleagues who suggest that family planning funds will support abortions, let me say, and let me beg of you—there is enough misinformation about family planning in the world today. There is enough disease. Enough people have died. Enough women and children have suffered. Family planning from the United States is provided for one purpose and one purpose only: to end the spread of misinformation about family planning—to end the death, poverty, and disease that comes from the spread of myths and lies.

Family planning does not support abortions. It saves lives. I urge my colleagues to support the release of family planning funds—funding which has already been appropriated and approved. Do it now. Do it today. The lives of women and children depend upon it.

Ms. DUNN. Mr. Chairman, I thank you for the opportunity to reiterate my position on what has been referred to as the Mexico City policy—a policy regarding the appropriation of taxpayer funds for the population assistance activities of any foreign private, nongovernmental, or multilateral organization.

My position on taxpayer-financed family planning has been well established over the course of the previous two Congresses. I believe in family planning programs. I believe they help women and children. I also believe, however, in placing restrictions on how taxpayer dollars are used in pursuit of family planning. Simply put, I believe that the use of taxpayer dollars to pay for or promote abortion is inappropriate, except under circumstances of rape or incest, or to protect the life of the mother.

The Mexico City policy—that taxpayer funds intended for international family planning should not be directed to organizations that



perform or promote abortion, except in the instances of rape, incest, or to protect the life of the mother—has been raised several times in recent years. I continue to support the main thrust of that policy, and I continue to hold to the view that our government ought to be neutral on the difficult question of abortion. I take the libertarian view that government ought not to be involved in this most difficult and personal of decisions, and will continue to support legislation which is consistent with that view.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Chairman, the Clinton administration has embarked on what is no less than a worldwide crusade promoting abortion on demand at any time for any reason anywhere. I cannot condemn that policy in words strong enough.

So let me just make a quick point in the short time that I have to speak this morning. Contrary to what some of those on the other side have said, this vote is indeed about abortion. It has always been about abortion. We simply say to foreign nongovernmental organizations: Unless you agree not to perform abortions, and not to violate the laws, and lobby to change the laws, of other countries with respect to abortion, then don't come to this country asking for tax dollars. That is all we are saying.

I have only been in Congress for a little more than two years yet I am voting today for the eighth time on the restoration of the Mexico City policy—a simple, straight-forward pro-life policy initiated by President Reagan carried on by President Bush and eagerly decimated by President Clinton in his first days in office. I hope that this year, the Congress will finally bring this debate to an end and do the right thing. Let's stop the international abortion crusade today.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Gephardt-Army resolution and support the administration in releasing family planning funds immediately.

Family planning works, it is a proven policy that has helped to stabilize the world's population.

There are only two ways to reduce unwanted pregnancies: sexual abstinence and safe and effective contraception.

By not releasing these funds now and by continuing to keep delaying the funds, which the administration has already certified is causing irreparable harm to family planning efforts around the world, we are harming efforts to get that message out and are, in turn, contributing to the increase of unsafe abortions rather than reducing them.

In fact, the former chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, Senator Hatfield, a strong pro-life advocate, unequivocally disagreed with the proponents of the Smith resolution and said that there was no evidence to support the claim that U.S. funding was being used to provide or promote abortion. The distinguished Senator went on to say that efforts to impede the release of family planning funds was not reducing abortions, rather it would increase and contribute to unsafe abortions.

This vote is not about abortion, U.S. law already prohibits the funding of and promotion of abortion.

We have already accepted a 35-percent cut in family planning funding which in of itself is a significant hit. But it was a bipartisan agreement and now we must all honor that agreement.

By releasing the family planning funds now, millions of women and family will have access

to family planning counseling prenatal care and preventative health care.

Mr. Speaker, I call on my colleagues to support the Army-Gephardt resolution and vote to immediately release these critical funds.

Mr. BUNNING. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the President's request to release \$123 million in foreign aid to support an international pro-abortion agenda.

I have one question for my colleagues today. Why in the world should we ask the American taxpayer to provide funding for abortions administered overseas when we don't provide Federal funding for abortions in the United States? It makes no sense at all.

We know that in many areas of the world, the population is growing out of control and that something must be done to control this massive problem. However, a "no" vote on the President's resolution will not jeopardize our status as a world leader in this area. It will simply confirm that abortion is not an acceptable form of birth control.

This body has made it clear on several occasions that we are willing to provide funds for international family planning programs if the participants will simply promise not to use abortion or lobby for the use of abortion.

Many of the international organizations that benefit from this funding are taking part in highly questionable practices.

We know that the International Planned Parenthood Federation in London has a history of cooperating with the one-child abortion policies in China. This organization has also been involved in active lobbying to convince developing nations in Africa, Asia and the Americas to overturn their abortion laws. Is this something we need to pay for? I don't think so.

The question before us today is not whether we should support international family planning and education programs.

The question today is whether or not this nation, and this body, supports the use of abortion as a means of family planning.

As far as I am concerned, the term "family" and "abortion" are totally incompatible.

This Nation and this Congress cannot and should not subsidize programs and organizations which advocate abortion or which lobby for the legalization or expansion of abortion as a means of limiting population growth.

We should not allow abortion to become the next major U.S. export.

It is true that the Helms amendment prevents the direct use of U.S. funds to pay for abortion procedures, but it does not prevent indirect funding of programs that promote the legalization or expansion of access to abortion as a means of birth control in developing nations. To do that we must defeat the resolution and reinstate the Mexico City policy.

I urge my colleagues to defeat this resolution; help us reinstate the Mexico City policy and show the world that we are willing to support education and other family planning practices but not at the expense of the innocent unborn.

Vote "no" on this resolution and vote "yes" on Smith-Hyde-Oberstar.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I strongly support House Joint Resolution 36 to endorse the Presidential finding and release international family planning funds on March 1.

Family planning programs are common sense. Democrats and Republicans ought to put partisan differences aside and come together to support population assistance. Mr.

GEPHARDT and Mr. ARMEY have set an excellent example of bipartisanship by cosponsoring this important bill.

U.S. population assistance aid is critical to our world's future. The high rates of population growth in developing countries affect Americans through its impact on the environment, immigration, and the economy. Unintended pregnancies threaten the society of developing countries as well: it can put economic development at risk, it damages the health and economic status of families, and increases the abortion rate.

Mr. Chairman, I urge this Congress to support family planning services. It is not a pro-choice or pro-life issue; it is a pro-family issue. This vote today is very important. If we don't vote to release the funds on March 1, we will reduce this year's total population assistance program funding by \$123 million. At least 17 worldwide programs will need to defer, suspend, or terminate family planning health care services. The consequences of the delay would be enormous; there would be more unintended pregnancies, more abortions, and more maternal and infant deaths, and more economic and environmental strain on families and societies.

Opponents of this legislation argue that we should place extreme restrictions on health care providers who receive U.S. aid. I oppose this draconian policy: denying families the right to plan their childbearing is wrong. Access to birth control is good for children, good for families, good for the environment, and good for the society. I urge my colleagues to vote to support House Joint Resolution 36 and release the previously appropriated family planning assistance funds on March 1.

Mrs. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to state my absolute opposition to the President's proposal to send taxpayer dollars overseas to promote abortions. We simply cannot allow the administration to continue its policy of ignoring the fundamental rights of the unborn.

The argument has been made that family planning funds serve to decrease the number of abortions performed in developing countries. If this is the case and if we are to ensure that family planning programs respect the basic right to life, then the President should not object to the pro-life safeguards on four separate occasions in the last Congress, standing up emphatically for the rights of the unborn. The President's refusal to accept these reasonable safeguards is proof of the underlying abortion agenda of this administration and the international groups which support a similar position.

I urge this body to say no to a plan that exports abortion policies to developing countries. The right thing to do is to support the alternative resolution, offered by Representative CHRIS SMITH, which reinstates the Reagan-Bush Mexico City policy protecting the unborn.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of House Joint Resolution 36, which approves the President's finding that withholding family planning funds has a negative impact on international population programs.

These funds are crucial to the health of women worldwide, and represent the single most effective means our country uses to reduce the worldwide rate of abortion.

A recent Rockefeller Foundation report amply demonstrates the importance and success of America's three-decade commitment



to family planning programs: in countries where such programs are active, contraceptive usage rates among women have increased from 10 to 50 percent. This has resulted in lowering the average number of children borne by women in these nations from six to three, helping millions of women evade poverty and maintain their health. According to a UNICEF report, family planning programs, by helping women avoid risky pregnancies, can prevent up to 100,000 of the 600,000 annual maternal deaths. It's no wonder organizations like CARE and Save the Children strongly support this resolution.

I also stand in firm opposition to the Smith-Oberstar alternative resolution, which would reinstate the Mexico City gag order and delay the release of already appropriated family planning funds 4 additional months. I hope my colleagues will not be fooled by this antifamily planning resolution. Under current law, no U.S. funds can be used to perform or lobby for abortions. For the past 24 years, no one has produced any evidence that one penny of this funding has ever been used for abortion. In fact, the Smith bill will, in the words of passionate abortion opponent Senator Mark Hatfield, "contribute to an increase of abortions worldwide." By some estimates, the Smith bill could result in an additional 1.6 million abortions worldwide.

Furthermore, this resolution, if approved, will merely release funds which have already been appropriated—it will not, as opponents of family planning have suggested, add a single penny to our foreign aid spending.

Mr. Speaker, this bill doesn't provide any new spending. It will help save the lives and health of millions of women and keep many more children from becoming orphans. And it will decrease the number of abortions performed worldwide. I strongly urge my colleagues to pass this pro-family, pro-woman resolution.

Mrs. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to House Joint Resolution 36, approving President Clinton's findings regarding international population planning programs and instead urge my colleagues to join me in supporting House Resolution 581, the Family Planning Facilitation and Abortion Funding Restriction Act. House Joint Resolution 36 would not just allow for the early release of an additional \$123 million in fiscal year 1997 for international family planning organizations. It would also allow these groups to perform abortions and promote and lobby for abortion as a family planning option within their home country.

As an alternative, I join Congressmen SMITH, HYDE, and OBERSTAR in supporting international family planning while also ensuring that organizations that use Americans' tax dollars agree not to either promote or perform abortions overseas. Simply put, abortion is not a method of family planning.

Behind the smoke and mirrors of today's debate is the fact that supporting the President's resolution (H.J. Res. 36) will result in the promotion and performance of abortions overseas. As an alternative, I ask my colleagues to join me instead in supporting a bipartisan alternative, the Smith-Oberstar-Hyde bill (H.R. 581) that will release an additional \$292.6 million in U.S. funds for international family planning programs in fiscal year 1997—bringing the total fiscal year 1997 spending on these programs to \$713 million. But more important,

the bill will ensure that foreign nongovernmental organizations receiving U.S. funds are not performing or promoting abortions in developing countries except in the cases of rape, incest, or when the life of the mother is in danger.

The restrictions on abortion in the Smith-Hyde-Oberstar alternative are not without precedent. The 1994 International Conference on Population and Development held in Cairo reiterated that "in no case should abortion be promoted as a method of family planning." Furthermore, from 1984 to 1993, the United States Government supported international family planning programs with these pro-life measures known as the Mexico City policy. Under this policy, over 350 family-planning groups received funding. We should renew our commitment by voting for House Resolution 581.

I urge my colleagues to join with me in supporting true family planning and not abortion. Vote for the Family Planning Facilitation and Abortion Funding Restriction Act. Voting for the President's resolution is not just agreeing with his finding that delaying family planning dollars has had a negative effect. It also gives the green light to the promotion and performance of abortions overseas.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Chairman, today I rise to speak in support of House Joint Resolution 36 which allows for the early release of international family assistance funding. As my colleagues know, the administration and the Republican leadership made an agreement last September to allow the funding for international family assistance to go forward in July, with the possibility of release of the funds in March if the President certifies to Congress that the delay is having an adverse impact on the family planning program and both Chambers pass legislation to approve the early release. Last week, the President sent his certification to us.

According to the President's report, delaying the release of funds undermines U.S. efforts to promote child survival and actually increases the number of abortions worldwide. Evidence from all regions of the world shows that increased contraceptive use, by reducing unintended pregnancies, plays a major role in reducing abortions. Reductions in the rate of abortion as a result of increased contraceptive use have been documented in countries such as Russia, the central Asian republics, Mexico, and Colombia. In Russia alone, an increase of only 5 percent in contraceptive use over 4 years led to a decrease of 30 percent in the annual abortion rate. Why turn back this progress?

One would think that abortion opponents would rush to support family planning assistance since it reduces the number of abortions. Unfortunately, this is not the case, considering the permission by the Rules Committee to include consideration of House Resolution 581 which would allow early release of funds with unnecessary and onerous restrictions on the assistance. Contrary to what the supporters of House Resolution 581 claim, current law prohibits the use of any foreign aid funds for abortion or for motivating anyone to seek an abortion. The U.S. agency for international development has followed this policy for years and has strict procedures in place to ensure compliance.

Family planning has proven effective in preventing abortions, maternal and child deaths.

If we delay support for family planning by even 4 months, denying safe and effective contraception to couples who depend on these programs, we will see a rise in unintended pregnancies and maternal deaths and a tragic recourse to unsafe and unsanitary methods to terminate those pregnancies.

This vote is about family planning and releasing delayed fiscal year 1997 funds; no new or additional funds are involved. This vote directly affects the life prospects of countless women and children in developing nations. I strongly urge my colleagues to support House Joint Resolution 36 and vote "no" on House Resolution 581.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman. I rise to support the release of family planning funds, that have been held hostage to unwarranted anti-choice forces in the Congress for more than 4 months now.

We here today are on a rescue mission. For if we fail to pass this resolution, the funds will be held hostage until July 1, 9 months into the fiscal year. This is unacceptable.

This is not about spending more money or new money. It is about the previously allocated international family planning funds that have not been released. The President has certified that this delay is harming our efforts to reduce unintended pregnancies abroad. These funds must be released now.

Releasing these funds will improve women's health, reduce poverty, and protect our global environment.

International family planning promotes preventive health care such as prenatal care, helps women to plan and space their pregnancies farther apart, and prevents unintended pregnancies that may threaten women's health and the health of their babies.

Do our programs work? As David Broder commented in the Washington Post, "the success of the program is undeniable." Studies have shown for the past three decades the percentage of women using contraception in foreign countries that receive this type of assistance has risen from 10 percent to 50 percent, and the average number of children they have borne has been reduced from six to three.

Some say that our international family planning efforts increase abortion. This is absolutely false. No U.S. dollars are used to provide abortion services either in the United States or abroad. In fact, it has been illegal to use U.S. funds to provide abortion services abroad since 1973. I happen to disagree with this policy, but it is the policy nonetheless.

Family planning does not increase abortions, it reduces them. Senator Mark Hatfield recognizes this, World Vision recognizes this, and I believe that even most people in this Chamber recognize this. But you cannot claim to support family planning and vote against this resolution. Only passage of this resolution will lead to release of the international family planning funds.

Let there be no mistake about it, this is a vote about choice, but it is not a vote about abortion.

It is about a choice between supporting family planning or opposing it.

It is about a choice between protecting women's lives or harming them.

In fact, this is about a choice between right and wrong, and quite seriously about a choice between life and death.

I urge my colleagues to choose wisely, to protect women's lives, and to support this resolution.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, today I voted in support of House Joint Resolution 36, a resolution to release funds for international family planning on March 1, 1997, which passed the House of Representatives by a vote of 220-209 on February 13, 1997. I made this decision after careful consideration and deliberation. Former U.S. Senator Mark Hatfield of Oregon, who is pro-life, sent a letter last fall to Representative CHRIS SMITH expressing his concern about the detrimental effect of the delay in funding for these programs.

\* \* \* Chris [Smith (R-NJ), author of H.R. 581], you are contributing to an increase of abortions worldwide because of the funding restrictions on which you insisted in last year's funding bill. It is a proven fact that when contraceptive services are not available to women throughout the world, abortion rates increase. We have seen it in the former Soviet Union where women had no access to family planning and relied on abortion as their primary birth control method. Some women had between eight and twelve abortions during their lifetimes. This is unacceptable to me as someone who is strongly opposed to abortion.

Based on this statement and other information from pro-life Members of Congress, including Representative TONY HALL, I voted in support of House Joint Resolution 36, a resolution to release international family planning funds on March 1, 1997. Since it is my objective to decrease the number of abortions, this pro-life vote is the only vote I could conscientiously cast. Those Agency for International Development [AID] international family planning funds are prohibited by law from being used for abortion services. This prohibition is carefully monitored by AID and by independent audits.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, I also voted in support of H.R. 581, the Chris Smith resolution, which would release funds as early as March 1 as long as recipients abide by the Mexico City policy, which prohibits these funds from going to organizations that also provide abortion services. I have been a long time supporter of the Mexico City policy. I also support family planning which reduces abortion—and oppose the use of Federal funds for abortion except to save the life of an indigent mother. However, since President Clinton waits for H.R. 581 with his veto pen thus giving the legislation virtually no chance of becoming law, I had to support House Joint Resolution 36 in order to provide funding for family planning services that are proven to prevent abortion.

KLECZKA. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the resolution, House Joint Resolution 36, to release international family planning funds beginning March 1, as recommended by the President, and to oppose H.R. 581, which would place restrictions on international family programs that already exist in Federal law.

The release of funds contained in House Joint Resolution 36 has been delayed 5 months, and a report by the administration states that further delay will cause serious, irreversible, and avoidable harm to family planning programs. The report further indicates that a delay of 4 months will increase the incidence of unintended pregnancies, maternal and child deaths, and abortions.

Those who oppose this family planning program assert that U.S. funds are being used for abortions. Nothing could be further from the

truth. Current Federal law prohibits the use of U.S. funds for abortions or abortion counseling. The Agency for International Development, which administers these funds, has strict procedures to assure no U.S. funds are used for abortion. These procedures include legally binding contract provisions forbidding such activity, staff monitoring, and regular audits by nationally recognized accounting firms.

Even a highly respected pro-life advocate, former Senator Mark Hatfield, has found no evidence to suggest U.S. family planning funds are used to fund abortions in other countries. In a September 24, 1996, letter to Representative CHRIS SMITH, who is offering H.R. 581, Senator Hatfield said:

I have reviewed the materials you recently sent to my office in response to my request that you provide proof that U.S. funds are being spent on abortion through AID's voluntary international family planning program. Unfortunately, I do not see anything in these materials to back up your assertion.

I have received no evidence to contradict Senator Hatfield's belief.

Those who say providing funds to family planning agencies increases abortions need to review the evidence to the contrary. Here are some examples:

Russia: From 1990 to 1994, contraceptive use increased by 5 percent, and the total number of abortions fell by 800,000.

Hungary: A dramatic increase in contraceptive use from the late 1960's to 1986 resulted in a drop in abortion rates from 80 per 1,000 women to about 30 per 1,000 women.

Chile: From 1960 to 1990, an increase in contraceptive use resulted in a drop in abortion rates from 77 per 1,000 women to 45 per 1,000.

By supporting the expedited release of these family planning funds, we in fact will decrease the incidence of abortions internationally. In a letter to congressional leadership, Reverend Leo O'Donovan, president of Georgetown University, said,

Your vote to release these funds on March 1, 1997 rather than delaying until July 1, 1997 will make a tremendous difference to countless families. Our program and international efforts in natural family planning are dependent on these federal resources.

The Smith bill, H.R. 581, would unnecessarily restate the existing abortion prohibition and would restrict the expenditure of family planning organizations' own funds. We have the right and the responsibility to place conditions on U.S. taxpayer moneys, but not on all the resources of these groups.

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of House Joint Resolution 36 and to oppose the Smith bill at this time. We will have numerous opportunities in this 105th Congress to cast votes on real abortion issues. Although H.R. 581 is cast as one, it fails the test.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chairman, I encourage my colleagues to support the Presidential finding that family planning appropriations should be released on March 1 because any further delay would seriously impact this very important program.

Congress should support family planning programs because they are a crucial tool in international efforts to curb global overpopulation. At current growth rates, we will add more humans in the next 50 years than in all previous 500,000 years of human history. In the next decade alone, world population will increase by 1 billion people. This growth means

more than longer lines at Safeway or at the local drug store. Unrestrained population growth devastates environmental resources, exacerbates immigration pressures, and raises the specter of worldwide malnutrition and the spread of infectious diseases.

I also support family planning funds because I support healthy families. Numerous studies have documented that mortality rates for women and children are highest when births are too close together, when women have many children, and when women give birth at very young and old ages. These family planning funds will enable mothers and fathers around the world to raise the healthiest children they can.

In addition, U.S. family planning aid often goes to families that have no other recourse. It is estimated that 77 percent of the couples using contraceptives in developing countries, excluding China, depend on publicly financed family planning programs.

We only need to look to Mexico for indices of the success of family planning. Due in part to foreign family planning assistance, the average Mexican woman now has 2.7 children, a dramatic reduction from the average of 6.7 children in 1970. Family planning is about thinking ahead. It's about giving families, especially poor families, the chance to make choices for their future. Let's not make the choice for them.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of House Joint Resolution 36, which provides for the release of U.S. contributions to international family planning programs.

For over 30 years America has been a supporter of international family planning. These programs have improved the health of millions of women and children, eased the environmental impact of rapid population growth, and prevented millions of unwanted pregnancies.

But in the past 2 years, Congress has withheld, cut or placed arbitrary restrictions on these programs.

Approximately 4 million women, who do not have access to modern contraception, medical advice or prenatal care, will have an unwanted or dangerous pregnancy, resulting in nearly 2 million more abortions or miscarriages. Funding restrictions only add to these numbers.

Unless we vote today to release the funds already appropriated, we will create even greater obstacles to common sense family planning. If this resolution is defeated there will be an increase in maternal death, there will be an increase in abortions, and there will be an increase in malnutrition.

The support of the United States for international family planning has helped families space out the birth of their children and has increased the odds that there will be enough food and other essentials to be shared among all family members. We've enabled women to bear children when they are physically strong and can breast-feed normally—increasing child survival by as much as 20 percent.

These funds have not sponsored or supported abortion. For 20 years, the U.S. Agency for International Development has prevented any money distributed by the Federal Government from being used to perform abortions or motivate anyone to have one. This is current law, and nothing in this resolution will change it.

Mr. Speaker, for three decades Republicans and Democrats, pro-life and pro-choice,

have supported a significant American role in international family planning. I urge my colleagues to reaffirm that support today by voting in favor of House Joint Resolution 36.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for debate has expired. Pursuant to section 581A(e) of the Foreign Operations Appropriations Act for 1997, no amendment is in order and the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. SENBRENNER] having assumed the chair, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, Chairman pro tempore of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 36) approving the Presidential finding that the limitation on obligations imposed by section 581A(a) of the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 1997, is having a negative impact on the proper functioning of the population planning program, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 220, nays 209, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 22]

YEAS—220

Abercrombie	Clayton	Farr
Ackerman	Clement	Fattah
Allen	Clyburn	Fawell
Andrews	Condit	Fazio
Baesler	Conyers	Filner
Baldacci	Coyne	Flake
Barrett (WI)	Cramer	Foglietta
Bass	Cummings	Foley
Becerra	Danner	Ford
Bentsen	Davis (FL)	Fowler
Bereuter	Davis (IL)	Fox
Berman	Davis (VA)	Frank (MA)
Berry	DeFazio	Franks (NJ)
Bilbray	DeGette	Frelinghuysen
Bishop	Delahunt	Frost
Blagojevich	DeLauro	Furse
Blumenauer	Dellums	Ganske
Boehlert	Deutsch	Gejdenson
Bonior	Dicks	Gekas
Borski	Dingell	Gephardt
Boswell	Dixon	Gibbons
Boucher	Doggett	Gilchrest
Boyd	Dooley	Gilman
Brown (CA)	Dunn	Gonzalez
Brown (FL)	Edwards	Gordon
Brown (OH)	Ehrlich	Green
Campbell	Engel	Greenwood
Capps	Eshoo	Gutierrez
Cardin	Etheridge	Hall (OH)
Castle	Evans	Hamilton

Harman	Matsui	Rush
Hastings (FL)	McCarthy (MO)	Sabo
Hefner	McCarthy (NY)	Sanchez
Hilliard	McDermott	Sanders
Hinchev	McGovern	Sandlin
Hinojosa	McHale	Sawyer
Hobson	McKinney	Schiff
Hooley	McNulty	Schumer
Horn	Meehan	Scott
Houghton	Meek	Serrano
Hoyer	Menendez	Shaw
Jackson (IL)	Millender-	Shays
Jackson-Lee	McDonald	Sherman
(TX)	Miller (CA)	Sisisky
Jefferson	Miller (FL)	Skaggs
Johnson (CT)	Minge	Slaughter
Johnson (WI)	Mink	Smith, Adam
Johnson, E. B.	Moakley	Smith, Snyder
Kanjorski	Molinari	Spratt
Kaptur	Moran (VA)	Stabenow
Kelly	Morella	Stark
Kennedy (MA)	Murtha	Stokes
Kennedy (RI)	Nadler	Strickland
Kennelly	Neal	Tanner
Kilpatrick	Olver	Tauscher
Kind (WI)	Owens	Thomas
Klecicka	Pallone	Thompson
Klink	Pascrell	Thurman
Klug	Pastor	Tierney
Kolbe	Payne	Torres
Lampson	Pelosi	Towns
Lantos	Pickett	Turner
Lazio	Pomeroy	Upton
Leach	Porter	Velazquez
Levin	Price (NC)	Vento
Lewis (CA)	Pryce (OH)	Visclosky
Lewis (GA)	Ramstad	Waters
Lofgren	Rangel	Watt (NC)
Lowey	Regula	Waxman
Luther	Reyes	Wexler
Maloney (CT)	Rivers	Wise
Maloney (NY)	Rothman	Woolsey
Markey	Roukema	Wynn
Martinez	Roybal-Allard	Yates

NAYS—209

Aderholt	Ehlers	Lipinski
Archer	Emerson	Livingston
Armey	English	LoBiondo
Bachus	Ensign	Lucas
Baker	Everett	Manton
Ballenger	Ewing	Manzullo
Barcia	Forbes	Mascara
Barr	Gallegly	McCollum
Barrett (NE)	Gillmor	McCrery
Bartlett	Gingrich	McDade
Barton	Goode	McHugh
Bateman	Goodlatte	McInnis
Bilirakis	Goodling	McIntosh
Bliley	Goss	McIntyre
Blunt	Graham	McKeon
Boehner	Granger	Metcalfe
Bonilla	Gutknecht	Mica
Bono	Hall (TX)	Mollohan
Brady	Hansen	Moran (KS)
Bryant	Hastert	Myrick
Bunning	Hastings (WA)	Nethercutt
Burr	Hayworth	Neumann
Burton	Hefley	Ney
Buyer	Herger	Northup
Callahan	Hill	Norwood
Calvert	Hilleary	Nussle
Camp	Hoekstra	Oberstar
Canady	Holden	Ortiz
Cannon	Hostettler	Oxley
Chabot	Hulshof	Packard
Chambliss	Hunter	Pappas
Chenoweth	Hutchinson	Parker
Christensen	Hyde	Paul
Coble	Inglis	Paxon
Coburn	Istook	Pease
Collins	Jenkins	Peterson (MN)
Combest	John	Peterson (PA)
Cook	Johnson, Sam	Petri
Cooksey	Jones	Pickering
Costello	Kasich	Pitts
Cox	Kildee	Pombo
Crane	Kim	Portman
Crapo	King (NY)	Poshard
Cubin	Kingston	Quinn
Cunningham	Knollenberg	Radanovich
Deal	Kucinich	Rahall
DeLay	LaFalce	Riggs
Diaz-Balart	LaHood	Riley
Dickey	Largent	Roemer
Doolittle	Latham	Rogan
Doyle	LaTourette	Rogers
Dreier	Lewis (KY)	Rohrabacher
Duncan	Linder	Ros-Lehtinen

Royce	Smith (OR)	Thune
Ryun	Smith (TX)	Tiahrt
Salmon	Smith, Linda	Trafilant
Sanford	Snowbarger	Walsh
Saxton	Solomon	Wamp
Scarborough	Souder	Watkins
Schaefer, Dan	Spence	Watts (OK)
Schaffer, Bob	Stearns	Weldon (FL)
Sensenbrenner	Stenholm	Weldon (PA)
Sessions	Stump	Weller
Shadegg	Stupak	Weygand
Shimkus	Sununu	White
Shuster	Talent	Whitfield
Skeen	Tauzin	Wicker
Skelton	Taylor (MS)	Wolf
Smith (MI)	Taylor (NC)	Young (FL)
Smith (NJ)	Thornberry	

NOT VOTING—4

Carson	Obey
Clay	Young (AK)

□ 1303

Mr. JEFFERSON, and Mr. OWENS changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SENBRENNER). The Chair will remind all persons in the gallery that they are here as guests of the House and that any manifestation of approval or disapproval is in violation of the rules of the House.

So the joint resolution was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PROVIDING FOR AN ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE FROM FEBRUARY 13, 1997, TO FEBRUARY 25, 1997, AND FOR AN ADJOURNMENT OR RECESS OF THE SENATE FROM FEBRUARY 13, 1997, TO FEBRUARY 24, 1997

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 21) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 21

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring).* That when the House adjourns on the legislative day of Thursday, February 13, 1997, it stand adjourned until 12:30 p.m. on Tuesday, February 25, 1997, or until noon on the second day after Members are notified to reassemble pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, which ever occurs first; and that when the Senate adjourns or recesses at the close of business on Thursday, February 13, 1997, pursuant to a motion made by the Majority Leader, or his designee, in accordance with this concurrent resolution, it stand recessed or adjourned until 11:30 a.m. on Monday, February 24, 1997, or such time on that day as may be specified by the Majority Leader or his designee in the motion to recess or adjourn, or until noon on the second day after members are notified to reassemble pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, which ever occurs first.

SEC. 2. The Speaker of the House and the Majority Leader of the Senate, acting jointly after consultation with the Minority Leader of the House and the Minority Leader of the Senate, shall notify the Members of the House and the Senate, respectively, to reassemble whenever, in their opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### FAMILY PLANNING FACILITATION AND ABORTION FUNDING RESTRICTION ACT OF 1997

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 46 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 46

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution, it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 581) to amend Public Law 104-208 to provide that the President may make funds appropriated for population planning and other population assistance available on March 1, 1997, subject to restrictions on assistance to foreign organizations that perform or actively promote abortions. The bill shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by Representative Smith of New Jersey or his designee and a Member opposed to the bill. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. SLAUGHTER] pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, as we know from the previous debate, we are here today as a result of an agreement reached last year between the Congress and the White House concerning international family planning assistance. The agreement signed into law stated that no family planning funds would be released until July 1997 unless the President determined that the delay was having a negative impact on the program.

We have now debated and voted on a privileged resolution to release those funds as the law calls for. Having considered the Army-Gephardt resolution, we have another option to expedite this funding. That is H.R. 5881, the Smith resolution, as it is called. The rule for the Smith bill is very straightforward. It is a closed rule with 1 hour of debate equally divided between proponents and opponents of the bill. The rule also provides for one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

While the rule is closed, it was the opinion of the Committee on Rules that a closed rule was appropriate for this alternative to the Army-Gephardt resolution, which was completely unamendable. I think we all agree on the need for a U.S. role in promoting legitimate family planning services. There are strong humanitarian, economic, and environmental reasons for this. How taxpayer dollars will be uti-

lized to support these programs, however, is where the controversy lies.

I tend to agree with many Members who feel that it makes sense regardless of your view on the issue of abortion, to ensure that precious U.S. taxpayer dollars are not used either directly or indirectly to promote or perform abortions. The Smith resolution would expedite the release of the family planning funds, just like the Army-Gephardt resolution. In addition, it would reinstate the Mexico City policy, as we call it, which worked honorably for 12 years during the Reagan and Bush administrations.

This policy, as my colleagues will recall, simply states that U.S. funds will not, repeat, not go to nongovernmental organizations that either promote or perform abortions. That is the issue. I would urge my colleagues to support this rule.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in strong opposition to the rule. The legislation that is made in order by this rule is just another transparent attempt to tack abortion restrictions onto legislation which is peripheral at best to the issue of abortion. We are talking today about family planning programs, family planning, not abortion. This is a critical distinction because effective family planning greatly reduces or even eliminates the demand for abortion.

Anyone who opposes abortion should be an ardent supporter of family planning. The bill we will consider on this rule proposes to reinstate the Mexico City policy and deny critical family planning funding to international organizations that reserve the right to provide abortions or abortion counseling with their own funds.

□ 1315

No one is suggesting that U.S. funding will go toward abortions in other nations. We have had these prohibitions against such use of U.S. funds in place since 1973.

The bill proposes to restrict access to family planning in order to reduce abortions. If reduction is the goal, this bill will be an utter failure because studies have proved, time and time again, that access to family planning reduces abortion.

In Russia, where for decades abortion was the primary form of birth control, contraception first became widely available in 1991. Between 1989 and 1995, abortions in Russia dropped from 4.43 million a year to 2.7 million a year, a 60 percent decrease. That should be compelling to anyone.

Why would anyone who wants to decrease abortions want to restrict access to family planning? How can they justify probably defunding organizations like the one in Russia? These statistics are repeated all over the world, in South Korea, Chile, and Hungary.

Family planning has a wide range of other benefits as well. By spacing births, women and families can improve infant survival and ensure that they have the resources to support their children. Spacing births at least 2 years apart could prevent an average of one in four infant deaths.

Finally, someone must speak for the millions of women around the world who desperately want access to family planning. Pregnancy and childbirth are still a very risky proposition for women in many parts of the globe that often lack electricity, hot running water, medical equipment, or trained personnel.

In Africa, women have a 1-in-16 chance of death from pregnancy and childbirth during their lifetime, and over 585,000 women in this world die every year from complications of pregnancy and birth. For each woman who dies, 100 others suffer from associated illnesses and permanent disabilities, including sterility.

If we could meet just the existing demands for family planning services, we could reduce the number of maternal deaths and injuries in the world by up to 20 percent. Many of these are women with families, who leave their children motherless. We cannot, in conscience, abandon them by cutting off what may be their only access to birth control information.

This bill would impose personal beliefs on family planning organizations throughout the world. How dare we, blessed as we are with practically information overload, the best health care system in the world, attempt to deny the only source of information services to families in the developing world?

Who are we to dictate the terms under which these groups provide essential services across the globe? We would be outraged, and rightly so, if the legislative body of any nation had the audacity to impose its will over organizations operating legally in our country by dictating the terms under which they would continue to receive the financial support they need to operate.

It is inhumane to restrict access to family planning in areas where it is desperately needed. We must not expose more women and families to the risks associated with unintended pregnancies. I urge my colleagues to vote against the rule and against the Smith bill.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE].

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from New York for her kindness and her leadership and the gentlewoman from California.

Although I did not want to rise to the floor of the House today to say that

this is one more vote on abortion, I simply have to say that, because for 30 years the United States led an international effort to reduce the toll of maternal deaths and unwanted pregnancies by providing money and pregnancy assistance for family planning throughout the international arena. It did it quietly and effectively. This was a vote for poor women across the Nation.

Now we come to legislation and the closed rule, which I rise to oppose, as well as the actual resolution, that would interfere with that quiet diplomacy helping women internationally have the safety and security of being able to protect themselves and their children.

The National Council for International Health estimates that cuts in 1996 family planning funds will result in approximately 8,000 women dying during pregnancy and childbirth and 134,000 infants dying from an increased number of high-risk births.

Do my colleagues realize in this coming year there will be an estimated 4 million unwanted pregnancies without family planning that will result in 1.6 million abortions?

This is not a discussion or a vote on abortion for those of us who believe in family planning. It is for those who constantly want to remind us that this is a decisive issue. I ask them to consider the poor women of this world, those women who, unlike those in America who also suffer sometimes from lack of good services, cannot even access the information to understand how to protect their children that are there with them and yet their unborn children.

I would ask that we understand that what we did just prior to this particular rule is the right way to go, to vote for family planning, unscrambled, unattacked, and ready to be presented, as America has always done, in a kind and loving way. Let us stand up for the women across the world. Let us oppose this rule and oppose the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I am providing for the RECORD a copy of my complete statement.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule and to H.R. 581. I support release of the already appropriated international family planning funds at the earliest possible date.

Family planning helps to improve the health and increase the survival rate of women and children during pregnancy, in childbirth, and in the years after. The National Council for International Health estimates that cuts in 1996 family planning funds will result in approximately 8,000 women dying during pregnancy and childbirth and 134,000 infants dying from an increased number of high risk births.

Family planning allows parents to control the number of children that they have and the timing of those births. And in so doing it allows women the opportunity to reach beyond the walls of their homes, to get an education, and to work outside of the family. A recent report of the Rockefeller Foundation argued that devoting less time to bearing children, reducing family size, and improving the health and sur-

vival of women and children results in better economic prospects in developing countries.

Representative SMITH and his supporters have attempted to mischaracterize this vote. They have misguidedly tried to recast a vote for international family planning as a vote for abortion.

What Representative SMITH neglects to consider is the fact that not a penny of these funds will be spent to either perform or promote abortion. That is against the law.

What Representative SMITH does not realize is that withholding these funds will reduce access to contraception and in so doing increase unintended and unwanted pregnancies. Experience demonstrates that as unintended pregnancies increase, so does the abortion rate.

The National Council for International Health estimates that the reduced funding will result in approximately 7 million couples in developing countries losing access to birth control methods. They estimate that 4 million unwanted pregnancies will result and that this could lead to as many as 1.6 million abortions.

What Representative SMITH does not discuss is the fact that withholding family planning funds, denies moneys to all countries even those such as Trinidad and Tobago where abortion is illegal.

My colleagues, this is not a vote on abortion. This is a vote to provide more options and opportunities for the people of developing nations around the world.

Representative SMITH's bill is not only ill advised, but it stands in violation of the spirit, if not the letter, of the compromise on international family planning funds that my Republican colleagues made with President Clinton last year.

For these reasons, I call upon each Member to signal their support for the health and welfare of women, children, and families in voting for House Joint Resolution 36 and against H.R. 581.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York. [Ms. VELAZQUEZ].

Ms. VELAZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this rule and this bill for one basic reason: It is antiwoman and it is antifamily.

It is not enough for our women here in the United States to be harassed and intimidated and to have family clinics bombed and burned; now we are considering restricting the human rights of women in other countries to control their bodies.

International family planning assistance has been responsible for reducing maternal deaths and unwanted pregnancies. Contrary to what antiabortion forces tell you, these Federal funds cannot be used to pay for abortions. If we truly want to decrease abortions, then we should release this assistance now without restrictions.

Two hundred twenty-five million women worldwide need family planning services to allow them to make informed decisions. We should be striving to empower poor women around the world, not denying families living in poverty this survival assistance.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend for yielding me this time.

This is a vote on the rule to allow H.R. 581 to be considered by the House. This is legislation that would provide additional monies beginning March 1 for family planning, and it would front-load \$385 million, metering, which is an 8-percent-per-month payout that is in the current law, and would be continued even if the Clinton resolution is adopted by the Senate. This gets rid of metering completely. So all of the money would be available.

Importantly, this legislation will also provide important pro-life safeguards so that the entities and the organizations that we contribute to do not continue their crusade with our money in one pocket and their money in the other pocket to bring down the right-to-life laws in the various countries.

Let me again remind Members that almost 100 countries around the world protect their unborn babies from the cruelty of abortion on demand. And let me remind Members again, abortion takes the life of a baby, whether it be suction abortions or dismemberment, where the babies' arms and legs are torn off. These are unpleasant realities, but they are the reality of what abortion does to unborn babies.

We have to make the world abortion free, not provide free abortion. The pro-abortion organizations, like the International Planned Parenthood Federation, based in London, and others, are absolutely vociferously committed to providing abortion overseas on demand. It is against the cultural values and the moral values of these countries. That does not matter. Their own literature is replete with admonishments, and it pushes and promotes their organizations to try to bring down these laws regardless of what the local populace thinks.

It is the ugly American all over again when we are part of that, trying to impose our cultural values upon these particular people. Human rights ought to be for the unborn and for all people.

It seems to me that birth is an event that happens to all of us. It is not the beginning of life. Human rights are indivisible. Life is a continuum. To say that everyone after birth has human rights and those before do not is contrary to reality and science. And again, these organizations are trying to promote an antithetical view with regard to human rights.

Let me also remind my colleagues that the Organization of American States has a human rights document that recognizes the right to life from the moment of conception. These organizations are working against that basic human right, and I think we should be very careful about to whom we contribute.

This rule allows H.R. 581 to come up for a vote. It is fair. Then we can have our debate on the merits. I think that is as it should be. Vote for the rule.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to take a moment to respond to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Frankly, I think the cruelest form of birth control is the fact that 600,000 women die in the world every year from complications, not understanding how to space their families. And it does not happen to all of us, it happens to the women in the world.

It is very important, if we want the emerging world, the developing world, to have a chance to be able to feed, to take care, to provide health care for their population. Part of that equation, without any doubt, is the ability to space and plan one's family.

To take that essential right away from the women of the world because we may believe that some organizations do not always believe what we think is the proper thing, we nonetheless know in this House that those organizations are prohibited from using any of these funds for abortion information or abortions.

What more can we say? Nobody has accused them of going ahead and using it. The fact of the matter is, what we are trying to do is save lives. It is as important as that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maine, [Mr. BALDACC].

Mr. BALDACC. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to the closed rule we are considering that would provide for consideration of H.R. 581 introduced by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

I believe that consideration of this legislation breaks the agreement that was reached between the President and Congress last year with respect to international family planning.

That agreement provided for a clean up or down vote on release of funds beginning on March 1 if President Clinton notified Congress that the delay in releasing the funds was having a negative impact on international family planning funds.

The agreement has resulted in a nearly 5-month delay in the release of international family planning funds and, as President Clinton has determined, has had a detrimental effect around the world.

The legislation introduced by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] continues to draw a mistaken connection between international family planning and abortion.

As we have already heard countless times on this floor today, current U.S. law prohibits use of any U.S. funds to pay for an abortion in international family planning. Regular independent audits of USAID have found absolutely no evidence that a single penny of U.S. money has ever been misused.

The only way to reduce the number of abortions around the world is to reduce the number of unintended and unwanted pregnancies. The best way to do that is to continue to fund voluntary family planning initiatives worldwide.

One study has shown that the reduction in funds for international family planning for fiscal year 1995 to fiscal year 1997 will deny 7 million couples in

developing countries access to modern contraceptive methods. This will result in 4 million unintended pregnancies. Based on historic patterns, this will lead to almost 2 million more unplanned births and 1.6 million more abortions than would have occurred already.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose the rule and vote against H.R. 581.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to say that certainly we do not want to get the rule mixed up with the controversy of the debate.

This is a good rule to bring the debate forward, and I would hope we would all support this rule.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. WELDON], my colleague and friend.

□ 1330

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time, and I rise in support of the rule and in support of the legislation introduced by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. Speaker, I think there has been a certain amount of confusion introduced regarding the real debate that we are discussing here. The legislation of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] actually increases the amount of money for family planning and makes it available earlier. It simply places some restrictions in there that are consistent with the Mexico City restrictions, restrictions that do not allow organizations that actively promote abortion services to have access to the funds.

One of the organizations that the President of the United States would like to distribute this money to, the International Planned Parenthood Federation, has a Vision 2000 document that they have made available, and I do not know if my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have read this thing, but not only do they want to promote the availability of abortion services, they actually want to work to advocate the overturning of existing law in these countries that do not make abortion available.

I do not think it is wise use of the U.S. taxpayers' dollars to take taxpayers' money to go and give it to an organization that is going to essentially lobby to have abortion laws overturned in foreign countries. I have people in my district who have trouble making ends meet. I have people in my district who have no health insurance. We shouldn't be taking their tax dollars and giving it to an organization that is pursuing this kind of an agenda.

So we have a very reasonable rule here and a very reasonable bill that it supports, that says you can have even more family planning money but we are just not going to give it to these certain groups that pursue this certain radical, left-wing, pro-abortion agenda.

Mr. Speaker, I highly encourage all my colleagues on both sides of the aisle

to support the rule and to support the legislation.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY].

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to this rule. The need for family planning services in developing countries is urgent and the aid we provide is both valuable and worthwhile.

Our international family planning programs promote economic and social development, improve basic standards of health and actually reduce the number of abortions worldwide. Nevertheless, securing funding for these critical programs continues to be a battle. In an effort to resolve this issue and pass the omnibus appropriations bill last year, the White House and the Republican leadership reached an agreement to hold a clean vote this month on the resolution that we just passed, fortunately.

We agreed to release these funds 5 months into the fiscal year instead of 9 months. Alternate legislation was never a part of this agreement. We never agreed to give opponents of family planning one last opportunity to gut these programs. But if H.R. 581 is considered by the House today, that is exactly what will happen. Allowing consideration of this bill will raise serious concerns about our ability to negotiate in good faith during this year's budget process.

That is really the key. An agreement was made. Promises made should be promises kept. In the spirit of bipartisanship, I urge Members to defeat this rule.

The restrictions on population funds in H.R. 581 are not new to us. We have faced these program gutting provisions several times before and we will undoubtedly face them again.

Today's vote should be the one vote we just took on the resolution and that one only. Anything else is a deal breaker. Again, promises made should be promises kept. In the spirit of bipartisanship, I urge Members to defeat this rule.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would like to take just a minute if I could to say that if I had my druthers, this bill would not go forward. This is an unreported bill and a closed rule, and I find that fairly egregious, particularly given the fact that we have just voted to support the President's privileged resolution.

However, we will not be calling for a vote. I simply want to voice my objection to the process by which this has happened. We are just beginning this process, and we hope we will not see it again.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to point out that the reason we are here is

because of deliberative democracy, a representative form of government that we have. I think that indeed instead of breaking promises, we are living up to promises here, promises to all parties who are interested in the full measure of this debate.

It is remembered, of course, that the previous item that we dealt with, that was brought forward earlier today, was unamendable, it was closed, and to round out this issue it was necessary to come forward with a second piece of legislation. This rule I think does it in a way that is entirely fair, and I believe it is in the best interests of deliberative democracy that we do this. I would also point out that there is a motion to recommit attached to it, so we have given an extra measure of fairness, we believe.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 46, I call up the bill (H.R. 581) to amend Public Law 104-208 to provide that the President may make funds appropriated for population planning and other population assistance available on March 1, 1997, subject to restrictions on assistance to foreign organizations that perform or actively promote abortions, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of H.R. 581 is as follows:

H.R. 581

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "Family Planning Facilitation and Abortion Funding Restriction Act of 1997".

(b) AMENDMENTS TO PUBLIC LAW 104-208.—Section 518A of subsection 101(c) of Public Law 104-208 is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by deleting, "July 1, 1997" and inserting "March 1, 1997";

(2) in subsection (c), by deleting "Such funds may be apportioned only on a monthly basis, and such monthly apportionments may not exceed 8 percent of the total available for such activities." and inserting "Subjects to the provision of subsection (b), such funds may be made available in such amounts as the President shall determine to be most conducive to the proper functioning of the population planning program."; and

(3) by adding the following new subsection: "(f) RESTRICTION ON ASSISTANCE TO FOREIGN ORGANIZATIONS THAT PERFORM OR ACTIVELY PROMOTE ABORTIONS.—

"(1) PERFORMANCE OF ABORTIONS.—

"(A) Notwithstanding any provision of law, no funds appropriated for population planning activities or other population assistance may be made available for any foreign private, nongovernmental, or multilateral organization until the organization certifies that it will not, during the period for which the funds are made available, perform abortions in any foreign country, except where the life of the mother would be endangered if the pregnancy were carried to term or in cases of forcible rape or incest.

"(B) Paragraph (a) may not be construed to apply to the treatment of injuries or illnesses caused by legal or illegal abortions or to assistance provided directly to the government of a country.

"(2) LOBBYING ACTIVITIES.—

"(A) Notwithstanding any provisions of law, no funds appropriated for population planning activities or other population assistance may be made available for any foreign private, nongovernmental, or multilateral organization until the organization certifies that it will not, during the period for which the funds are made available, violate the laws of any foreign country concerning the circumstances under which abortion is permitted, regulated, or prohibited, or engage in any activity or effort to alter the laws or governmental policies of any foreign country concerning the circumstances under which is permitted, regulated, or prohibited.

"(B) Paragraph (a) shall not apply to activities in opposition to coercive abortion or involuntary sterilization.

"(3) The prohibitions of this subsection apply to funds made available to a foreign organization either directly or as a subcontractor or subgrantee, and the required certifications apply to activities in which the organization engages either directly or through a subcontractor or subgrantee."

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HANSEN). Pursuant to House Resolution 46, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] and a Member opposed each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, during the last session of Congress, the House voted six times to restrict aid to foreign organizations that perform or promote abortions overseas. We also voted to restrict aid to the U.N. Population Fund unless the UNFPA, the U.N. Population Fund, ended its participation in the forced abortion program in the People's Republic of China.

Mr. Speaker, there is evidence, I think, looking at today's vote and talking to a large number of Members, that there still are a large number of Members who are still committed to the sanctity and preciousness of human life and said that they would vote yes—yes.

I happen to disagree that that was the way to go, but we now have H.R. 581 on the floor and there is an opportunity to manifest ourselves and put on the record very clearly and unambiguously that we want to release the funds for family planning, we want to release the \$385 million that otherwise would wait until July 1, but we want to do it with principle. We want to make sure that the money only goes to those organizations that will erect a wall of separation between family planning, which is preventive, and abortion, which takes the life of a baby.

Mr. Speaker, I think more and more Members in the partial birth abortion debate that we had last year began what I truly believe to be an awakening about the gruesomeness of abortion. Abortion takes the life of a baby, whether it be dismemberment of an un-

born child's body or chemical poisoning by way of injection or the suction machines which decimate the infant, abortion is violence. It kills babies. Whether it be illegal or legal abortions, the net effect on the child is always the same, one dead baby.

I think our aim in Congress and our aim in humanitarian efforts ought to be to eradicate abortion, to make the world abortion free. Family planning certainly plays a part in that. That is why my legislation and Mr. OBERSTAR's legislation and Mr. HYDE's legislation, H.R. 581, makes it very clear that we front-load the family planning money.

There is no waiting for it. The Clinton administration can have every dime, \$385 million, and that is a lot of money, to be used for family planning on March 1. The President will actually get more in our legislation, not more in the cycle of the appropriations, but more quicker as a result of this legislation if he accepts this rather than the resolution just passed.

What is the Mexico City policy? Just let me remind my colleagues that yes, there is such an amendment known as the Helms amendment. It says that we will not directly fund abortion overseas. But we found in the early 1980's, and I have been here for 17 years, I would remind my colleagues, we found in the early 1980's that that law was not preventing the promotion and performance overseas of abortion by these international organizations. They very simply took our money which we were providing, put it in one pocket, provided an accounting saying that if they did not spend it, then it freed up megadollars in their other pocket to be used for the performance of abortion.

Paper and accounting tricks does not, if you are talking about human life being destroyed, really does not cut it. We are fooling ourselves if we think we are mitigating the promotion of abortion with this approach. It has not worked. It is only half a loaf. We need, if we are serious about making the world abortion free and not promoting abortion, take that other step and reestablish the Mexico City policy.

In sum, what the Mexico City policy will do is say we will not contribute to those organizations that perform abortion except in cases of rape, incest, and life of the mother. It also says that we will not provide moneys to those organizations that lobby for or against abortion. It is abortion neutral in that regard.

If you are doing family planning, you should not also be wearing that other hat of being the abortionist organization in that given country. This is very, very significant, Mr. Chairman, in light of what these groups are actually doing on the ground day in and day out.

In the last debate I pointed out that there is a document, and this is one of many, but this document in particular is the abortion manifesto of the family planning groups. It is called Vision 2000: A Strategic Plan. This Vision 2000,



adopted in 1992 and agreed to by the 140 Planned Parenthood affiliates around the world, states, and I quote, and it says it throughout the document but this is one direct quote: The IPPF will "bring pressure on governments and campaign for policy and legislative change to remove restrictions against abortions."

This is the abortion lobby in the developing world. We ought to be very careful about to whom we contribute if that is what they are doing, if we care about abortion promotion. If we do not care about it, if we think that is fine and dandy, then you should not be for our bill but if you do care about abortion promotion, look at the consequences, giving money to these organizations means that, yes, they provide family planning, but they also promote abortion very, very aggressively.

Let me also point out that this particular policy known as the Mexico City policy, where did it get its name, at a conference on population at Mexico City in 1984, has worked, and worked extremely well. During the 9 years that it was in operation, more than 350 family planning organizations and providers accepted the Mexico City clauses and said that they would divest themselves of abortion and be exclusively family planners.

That is what we are all about here, honesty, transparency, no hidden agendas. If family planning is your game, that is what you get the money for, that is what your organization should be all about. But these organizations like to fudge that line of demarkation and say that abortion is just family planning after a conception has occurred and they try again to make no distinction, or very little distinction, between the two.

I urge Members, because this will be the beginning of a long fight in the 105th Congress on this. Yes, the Clinton resolution passed today. That will not be the end of it, I can assure you. We will be back on the authorizing bills, we will be back on the appropriations bills when the fiscal 1998 and the 1999 funds come up, and again we are going to continue with this 1997 effort as well. I hope that by the end of this Congress, every Member of this Chamber whether they are pro-abortion or pro-life will be fully aware of what these organizations are doing.

The Trojan horse is this. They say they are all about family planning, they get into the country, they start networking, their real agenda is abortion. They say it in Vision 2000. I urge Members to become acquainted with it intimately so that they know to whom we are giving. They are acting as surrogates for the Clinton administration in bringing down the right-to-life laws.

We need to stand up for those innocent children in these developing countries, provide humanitarian aid. And I take a back seat to no one on providing child survival aid and all kinds of other aid. I offered the amendments in the mid-1980's to provide money for immu-

nizations, oral dehydration, and other kinds of helps. That is what it is all about. Family planning is a part of that, but not when it is linked with abortion.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the bill but with the highest respect for the maker of the legislation. I want to reiterate what I said earlier on the debate on the privileged resolution, that I have the highest regard for the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and he is quite correct. He takes a back seat to no one on child survival issues in this Congress.

□ 1345

In fact he and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL] have been the champions for poor children throughout the world. On this issue, though, of whether the Mexico City language should apply to international family planning, I respectfully disagree with him, and I emphasize the word "respectfully."

With that, Mr. Speaker, I will take some time later to make my remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WATERS], the chair of the Congressional Black Caucus, and the fact is that Ms. MAXINE WATERS is a great leader on these international family planning issues.

Ms. WATERS. I thank the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI] for yielding time to me on this very important issue.

Mr. Speaker, today I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 581.

This bill would reinstate a gag rule on foreign organizations that receive U.S. family planning funds. It would forbid them from discussing abortion with women even if the procedure is legal in their own country and if the organization uses its own money, not U.S. funds, to provide counseling.

If this bill were to pass, countries which immensely benefit from U.S. planning aid, such as India, Bolivia, Jordan, and South Africa, where abortion is legal, by the way, could be disqualified from obtaining U.S. funds for contraceptives simply for complying with their own country's law on abortion.

Thus, an Indian or South African woman seeking advice on family planning would not be told of all of her options.

This is unacceptable.

Further, there is no evidence that the so-called Mexico City policy has decreased abortion at all.

The real issue at stake here is maternal and child health. If the United States continues to decrease international family planning funding,

money which has been slashed and whose disbursement has been delayed, we will be hurting millions of men and women who seek or rely on modern contraception to delay or postpone childbirth. We are punishing responsible people.

In funding year 1996, funds were effectively cut by 85 percent, and this is at a time when, internationally, 1 in 6 women of reproductive age are still in need of contraception to postpone or avoid future childbearing. Almost 600,000 women die during pregnancy and childbirth each year; 75 percent of these women die from attempting to abort an unwanted pregnancy themselves.

That is why family planning is so crucial. It saves lives.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for us to stop pretending that restricting discussion on abortion will stop it altogether. We need to continue to work with people to prevent unwanted and unsafe pregnancies in the first place.

I ask my colleagues to please reject the Smith bill.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY].

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the Smith resolution.

The Mexico City restrictions which this bill would impose will have a devastating impact on international family planning services throughout the world.

Here we go again. Every time we discuss international family planning, Mr. SMITH offers these restrictions. I certainly respect his views, and we have worked on many other issues together; however, his insistence on imposing these restrictions held up the foreign operations appropriations bill last year and could derail our efforts to get life-saving family planning money released this year.

The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] claims this resolution is not antifamily planning, just antiabortion. That just does not make sense. Currently no U.S. dollars are spent on abortion services overseas. In fact it has been illegal since 1973. These restrictions are stringently enforced by USAID.

In addition, as has been stated today on this floor time and time again, family planning services reduce the number of abortions worldwide. The Smith resolution will not stop abortions. It will only increase them.

One of the most important forms of aid that we provide to other countries is family planning assistance. We have heard countless stories today about the critical work done throughout the world by international family planning programs. These programs improve the health and well-being of men, women and children, they strengthen the economy, protect the environment, enhance the quality of life in developing nations, and most importantly save lives.

The Smith resolution is dangerous and extreme. It would defund family

planning organizations that perform legal abortions with their own money, not United States money. It would also impose a gag rule on U.S. based organizations and nongovernmental organizations that provide U.S. family planning overseas.

I would like to explain that to my colleagues. Doctors from USAID have told me personally about the horribly chilling effect of the gag rule. They have interviewed doctors in small villages who turned away women from botched illegal abortions bleeding to death, and they were afraid to refer this woman. They did so because they feared losing their U.S. funding if they helped the women or even gave her the name of another doctor.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the Smith resolution. It is an extreme piece of legislation that no matter how it is disguised, it is ultimately intended to end U.S. family planning overseas.

A vote for the Smith resolution is a vote against sensible, cost effective family planning programs. My colleagues, it is a vote against lifesaving services.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, just let me remind Members that, when Mr. Clinton sent up his 1994 rewrite of the Foreign Assistance Act, he intended and it was in the bill to absolutely repeal the Helms amendment so that direct funding would be used to pay for abortions overseas. So the administration on numerous occasions has signaled that they are every bit in favor of promoting abortion overseas.

As I said earlier in debate when they failed in that effort, we did not do plan 2, and that was to enlist the support of surrogates, namely groups like International Planned Parenthood Federation, based in London, and others to promote abortion for that under this subterfuge of saying that it is not our money. Well, we are giving to a group that is again promoting aggressively the abortion on demand.

And just to show how far down it gets, we recently came across a manual that was put out in the Dominican Republic by the affiliate of the IPPF, which is based in London, and it said this. It is called the Sex Education Manual, and the chapter on abortion makes it clear to the teachers at the end of the lesson that the students should, quote, become aware of the need to change the Dominican Republic's legislation on abortion.

So not only do they lobby legislators and governments and health officials again, and we empowered this group to be the bully on the block, but they also get into the schools and try to indoctrinate these children to bring down their right-to-life laws, and this is being replicated in every one of these countries.

Mr. Speaker, I have a copy of the manual if anybody wants to see it.

Let me also point out and use this chart to do so that the legislation that is pending before the House will provide more family planning money than the resolution just passed, not more over the cycle of an appropriations, but more up front. And that is very important. The Clinton finding earlier this month essentially said that, if the money does not come now, it is money denied, and that means terrible things will happen.

Mr. Speaker, if that be true, then the more up front the better. Our legislation, the Smith-Oberstar bill, provides \$410 million in fiscal year 1997 for family planning. Three hundred and eighty-five is for the family planning account, 25 for the United Nations Population Fund. The administration's request, 240 in fiscal year 1997. So we push out the door with our legislation more money for family planning. It is in the bill.

Please, I urge Members and friends just to read it.

The previous speaker said that the intent of what we are trying to do is to defund family planning. Nothing could be further from the truth. The plain language of the bill makes it clear we are putting more money, not less.

The argument was made back in 1984; I will never forget it, when the Mexico City policy was first put into effect, that the nongovernmental organizations, the NGO's, would never accept it. Well, friends, 350 and upward of 380 family planning organizations signed on the dotted line and said they would divest themselves from abortion and just do family planning. Only the International Planned Parenthood Federation of London and only Planned Parenthood Federation of America stood out and said we are so committed, so obsessed with promotion abortion overseas that we would lose the money rather than take the money and divest themselves of abortion.

So this will be a vote on abortion today. It is pro-family planning, and it is indeed both pro-life and pro-family planning.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. NADLER].

(Mr. NADLER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose this bill, which would seriously harm our international family planning programs. I strongly support family planning. I voted for the previous resolution that will release the funds for family planning without condition because I believe that these funds will improve women's health, reduce poverty, and protect our global environment. But I will not vote for this bill.

The supporters of this bill claim that our family planning efforts increase the number of abortions. This is simply not true. By law and by practice, U.S. funds cannot be used to provide abor-

tion services either in the United States or abroad. AID has implemented procedures that carefully monitor the spending of these funds, and independent audits confirm that not \$1 of U.S. funds is used to perform abortions.

I disagree personally with this policy, but it is the policy and the law nonetheless.

The real problem with this bill is that, by saying to clinics that they may not use other funds to perform abortions, it will force many health clinics which will not accept such conditions to close for lack of funding. These closed clinics will no longer help women receive prenatal care, will no longer prevent more women from dying during childbirth, will no longer help prevent unintended pregnancies and therefore will no longer help reduce the number of abortions. The number of abortions will increase, not decrease, if this bill were to pass.

So if my colleagues support family planning and want these clinics to remain open, then they must oppose this completely unnecessary bill and vote against it.

This bill is really about family planning, about closing family planning clinics and not about preventing the use of Federal funds from being spent on abortions, which is already against the law, which does not happen. This is an unnecessary, pernicious, and harmful bill that will simply result in more unwanted pregnancies, more fatalities among women, and more abortions.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Idaho [Mrs. CHENOWETH].

Mrs. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I come forward today to express my strong support for a bipartisan alternative to President Clinton's resolution. The President's resolution will release an additional \$123 million for population control programs for fiscal year 1997 without any pro-life safeguards, and that is what our debate is all about. We need pro-life safeguards.

My colleagues, we object to giving the administration more money to spend this year unless the White House agrees to ensure that these family planning funds will not support organizations which perform or promote abortion.

Mr. Speaker, abortion should not and need not be interjected into the population assistance program as the Clinton administration has done. The President's resolution does not increase funding for international family planning. Rather, what it does is permit the U.S. Agency for International Development to begin spending certain appropriated funds for population control at a date earlier than was established by law last fall. This will result in the promotion and performance of abortion overseas.

□ 1400

I urge my colleagues to support the Smith bill, which will provide international family planning funds with

pro-life safeguards. The Smith bill will increase U.S. spending for international family planning programs in 1997, which is what we all want, by nearly \$300 million, bringing the total 1997 spending on these programs to \$713 million. It will ensure that foreign nongovernmental organizations receiving U.S. funds are not performing or promoting abortions in developing countries, except in cases of rape, incest, or the eminent endangerment of the mother's life.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot be fooled, and none of us can be fooled, by the false claims of many international population groups who state that this is not an abortion issue. It is.

We must be firm and stipulate that no population funds will go to foreign, nongovernmental organizations that, No. 1, perform abortions except in the case of rape, incest, or the imminent endangerment of the mother's physical health; No. 2, violate the laws of any foreign country with respect to abortion; No. 3, engage in any activity or effort to alter the laws or governmental policies of any foreign country with respect to abortion.

My position on abortion has been clear and consistent. I oppose it, except in certain very specific cases. The White House privileged resolution will debase the whole medical profession, it debases our system of law, and indeed it debases our very notion of the concept of life.

Our system of laws, our American heritage, is based on the idea that people have certain God-given rights. Those rights are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Those rights existed before laws were established. In fact, it is because those rights existed that laws were established in order to protect those rights.

First and foremost among those rights is the right to life.

As lawmakers we have a responsibility to protect the lives of our citizens, in this case, the very youngest, most vulnerable of American citizens. We must also protect those sacred lives in foreign countries where we are having a direct impact on their international family planning programs.

I urge my colleagues to do the right thing. I urge my colleagues to stand against this hideous, repugnant practice.

If President Clinton believes, as he says, that abortion should not be promoted as family planning and that international family planning programs need more funding this year, he should abandon the rigid stance he has taken in negotiations to date and accept the terms by Congress.

Let us stand up for a good principle and support additional international family planning dollars which will go to organizations which will not perform or promote abortion as a method of family planning.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. CAPPS], a Member of the freshman class.

Mr. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI] for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I come to the United States as a former teacher of religion,

and I want to speak plainly about H.R. 581. Religious people representing a variety of traditions and denominations have very strong feelings on this subject. They know that the number of unwanted pregnancies is too high. They also know that the estimated 25 billion unsafe and illegal abortions annually is a moral issue that must be addressed. Therefore, there is a strong consensus that there should be voluntary access to family planning services. The evidence confirms that family planning prevents unwanted pregnancies.

Mr. Speaker, people of faith affirm that human life, human reproduction are intended by God to be a blessing for the world. Responsible stewardship of human reproduction dictates that each child is a blessing for that child, his or her family and the world. Giving people the tools to take responsibility for their own reproductive health is vital to achieving this goal.

H.R. 581 will devastate these programs. This bill will severely inhibit comprehensive reproductive health services by shutting down many foreign NGO's that provide these services. Because of this the Mexico City-H.R. 581 restrictions will result in more abortions around the world, not fewer.

This bill also runs contrary to a fundamental sense of stewardship. As retired Senator Mark Hatfield from Oregon said, I quote, "Anti-abortion speech will not reduce the number of unintended pregnancies as swiftly or as surely as our support for voluntary family planning."

Fully supporting international family planning programs is one of the most humane, moral, and ethical positions that we as a Nation can take. I vote "no" on H.R. 581.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ADERHOLT].

(Mr. ADERHOLT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 581, a bill that would literally save the lives of countless children throughout the world. I commend my colleague from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] for introducing this important bill which would prevent international family planning funds from being used for abortion.

I want to make this point very clear. Abortion is not family planning. I have heard many of my colleagues say that this debate is not about abortion, but rather about saving lives. How ironic. We have heard many say that this funding for family planning is essential. Congressman SMITH's bill allows even more funding for family planning, so long as the funds are not used to promote abortion.

The question we will vote on in a few minutes is quite simply whether you oppose taxpayers' funds being used to promote abortion in foreign countries or whether you oppose it, pure and simple. I am proud to stand today with those who oppose it and to support life.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the Smith bill.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. SHERMAN], also a Member of the freshman class.

(Mr. SHERMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, my predecessor, Congressman Tony Beilenson, served here for 20 years, and was one of the leading advocates of international family planning. In recognition of his legacy, my first speech on this floor is again in favor of international family planning, and in opposition to unwarranted restrictions on family planning that would be imposed by this proposal.

International family planning brings together so many things that both I and many of my colleagues, and I think the vast majority of those in my district, care about. We care about the environment, and unless we do something to control the international population explosion, virtually all of our other environmental controls will simply be like taking a few buckets out of the ocean. We care about the dignity of women. Women in Third World countries acquire additional status, dignity and rights when they gain control of their own bodies and are afforded a full range of reproductive freedom.

The other side has made this a debate on the choice issue. I do not think that it is. But to the extent that a no vote is an opportunity to say that we believe in a woman's right to choose, we have another good reason to vote against this proposal.

This vote is a chance for us to stand for peace and development in the Third World, which can occur only if we deal with the population explosion which so tragically affects so many underdeveloped countries. It is a chance for us to deal with the illegal immigration problem. With our support, Mexico has been able to cut its population growth rate by over one-third through effective international family planning assistance. We need to continue that effort.

Finally, it is important that this Government operate as efficiently as possible. We need to contract with the international family planning agencies that are most effected. We should not impose some sort of political correctness test and say that we will not contract with this agency or that agency, and end up instead going to a less effective family planning organization.

So whether it is control of illegal immigration, enhancing our environment, working toward government efficiency, defending a woman's right to choose, promoting the dignity of women, or seeking peace and prosperity for the underdeveloped portion of the world, a vote against this alternative is called for.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WATTS].

Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 581, and I congratulate the sponsors, and especially the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], for leading the effort on this bill, for presenting us with a responsible and viable alternative to House Joint Resolution 36.

H.R. 581 allows AID to begin spending international family planning funds on March 1, and the bill deletes the restriction which releases these funds only on a monthly basis. Proponents of the previous bill would certainly support those provisions.

So the debate is on the reinstatement of the Mexico City policy that this bill mandates. The Mexico City language is straightforward, and I quote: "No funds appropriated for population planning activities may be made available for any foreign, private, nongovernmental or multilateral organization until the organization certifies it will not perform abortions in any foreign country except where the life of the mother would be endangered or in cases of forcible rape or incest."

From 1985 to 1993, this language protected the American taxpayer from having their tax payments spent on abortion. For 8 years this language assured our great Nation would not directly or indirectly support or promote abortion as a method of family planning throughout the world. With all of the world's great crying needs, we should not be spending our scarce foreign aid dollars to subsidize and promote abortions.

The world looks to America for moral leadership. The world looks to America for justice for the weak and the disenfranchised. We should respond to this call for leadership, not by promoting abortion in the poorest nations of the world, but by helping them develop the economic and political infrastructure that encourages development and progress. Abortion does neither.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "yes" vote on H.R. 581.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. JOHNSON].

(Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote against the Smith legislation. Since 1973, no U.S. dollars for international family planning programs have been used for abortions. Not one. And it is not true that the Smith amendment will not impact women seeking family planning services, although the money provided is the same in both resolutions. Cutting off certain clinics because of how they use their own money does impact women.

In rural parts of the world it is not like Washington. There is only one health clinic. There is only one choice. Women there are lucky to have in fact one health clinic providing family planning services. They do not have a choice of clinics.

This vote is not about abortion, it is about family planning. By any measure, increased access to family planning decreases the number of abortions. The use of effective contraception has increased markedly throughout the world in the last 30 years. The percentage of couples in developing nations using family planning has increased from 10 to 50 percent, but we still have a long way to go. Nearly 230 million women worldwide, roughly one in six of reproductive age, are still in need of modern contraceptive methods in order to plan their families.

As the 20th century draws to a close, by the year 2000, some 800 million people, one-seventh of the world's population, will be teenagers in 4 years. While this reflects the incredible achievement of cutting down child mortality by half since 1950, it also has enormous implications for future population growth.

The U.N. predicts that in the next 50 years, world population, in just 50 years, will grow by 3.6 billion, the current population of Asia. Providing women with the power to control the number of children they have and to space them apart is good for women and children and for our world, and I urge opposition to the Smith amendment.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. KELLY].

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the Smith resolution, H.R. 581, which would reinstate the so-called Mexico City policy. I find the restrictive resolution to be superfluous.

We all know that in the 1973 Helms amendment, which prohibits any U.S. funds for abortion in international family planning, it is part of the permanent foreign aid statute. Furthermore, there is no evidence that any recipient of the U.S. funds has ever violated the terms of this Helms amendment.

This unnecessary layering of already restrictive law can only work to harm women and children worldwide by denying them the various health services provided by international family planning organizations.

The effects of the Mexico City policy are far-reaching and negative. According to UNICEF, every year 600,000 women die of pregnancy-related causes; 75,000 of these deaths are associated with self-induced, unsafe abortion. Is this the result we want?

In addition, the Mexico City policy serves as a threat, a gag order, that results in failure to assist women in need. For example, if a woman is suffering from a life threatening infection that is the consequence of a self-induced abortion, members of an international family planning organization might fear that treating such a woman would result in loss of funds. Is this the result we want?

To say that family planning is abortion is to trivialize a complex and crit-

ical issue. Family planning is prenatal care. Family planning is child nutrition. Family planning is followup and preventive care, and the education provided by family planning is often what enables children to survive their first year and what enables women to survive their pregnancy.

□ 1415

Do not impose this gag order. Provide the world with family planning education that works to eliminate the need for abortion. Let us defeat the Smith resolution.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida [Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN], chairman of the Subcommittee on International Economic Policy and Trade of the Committee on International Relations.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, the Clinton administration keeps telling us that we do not need to worry about how many hundreds of millions of dollars go to organizations that perform abortion overseas or that lobby for pro-abortion laws, because we already have laws on the books that forbid these organizations from using the actual U.S. taxpayer dollars to pay for the abortions or for the pro-abortion lobbying.

But this simply ignores the fact that money is fungible. When we give these pro-abortion organizations \$1 million, we instantly free up other money that they are free to use for whatever they want, including more abortions and more abortion lobbying. None of us would run our personal lives the way the Clinton administration wants us to run our government.

If one of us had a friend who was doing something of which we deeply disapproved, perhaps this friend had a drug habit, and asked us to give or lend him \$100 a month to buy drugs, of course, we would have to refuse. But then suppose that friend said, all right, I understand that you disapprove of drugs, but suppose you give me \$100 a month to help pay my rent. I promise not to use your \$100 for the drugs. I will apply your \$100 toward my rent, and that will free up my \$100 to buy drugs. We would still have to refuse, of course, because we would know that by giving the \$100 we would be enabling and empowering the friend to buy drugs.

Mr. Speaker, this is exactly the same way that the groups that perform and promote abortions go about their ways. If we give them an extra \$123 million and they remain in the abortion business, it does not make any difference whether they give us a piece of paper that says "We used your money to buy contraceptives and our money to perform abortions." By subsidizing and enabling and empowering these groups, we subsidize, empower, and enable all of their activities, including abortions.

The Clinton administration is, in effect, urging Congress to spend U.S. taxpayers' money and not worry too much

about the consequences. But we cannot ignore the way the world works. I urge my colleagues to support the Smith amendment.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I just want to make one point. In the earlier debate it was pointed out that World Vision wants to release these funds. I think it should be made very clear, World Vision is a group that I strongly support. They are into helping to alleviate suffering brought about by famine.

Let me read a letter dated February 7 from the president of World Vision, and it reads as follows: "Our organization supports the release of funds with the so-called Mexico City policy, which prevents U.S. Government funding from subsidizing foreign organizations which perform or promote abortion as a method of family planning, and lobbying to ease or diminish anti-abortion laws—either in the United States or in foreign countries."

"We believe," the World Vision letter goes on to say, and it is signed by Robert Seiple, "We believe these pro-life safeguards are important to protect the integrity of our efforts and those of many other humanitarian aid organizations."

Mr. Speaker, I ask that the full letter be made part of the RECORD, but I would point out that World Vision supports this legislation, they support the Mexico city policy.

The letter referred to is as follows:

WORLD VISION,

Washington, DC, February 7, 1997.

Hon. JOSEPH R. PITTS,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE PITTS: World Vision has not changed its position on abortion. I am writing to reiterate our position to you and other members of Congress following a January 31 letter regarding the release of funding for international family planning services. I signed the letter, along with the presidents of CARE and Save the Children.

Since it was established in 1950, World Vision has always and will continue to oppose abortion as a means of birth control. Abortion runs contrary to our core beliefs as a Christian organization. All of World Vision's efforts, both in the United States and in more than 100 countries around the world, seek to save, extend and enhance life. Toward our goals of enhancing and extending life, World Vision supports programs in developing nations to save children's lives. These programs include immunizations, disease prevention and treatment and efforts to improve nutrition. In addition, we encourage efforts to educate parents about maternal health, to avoid high-risk pregnancies and to advocate birth spacing.

These strategies help to avoid risky and unplanned pregnancies both to protect the life of the mother and to prevent women from resorting to abortion as a means of birth control. As President of World Vision, I have visited many of the programs in some of the most difficult places in the world. I have met with women in Africa, Asia and Latin America and other regions of the world who personally have benefited from these services.

We believe these pro-life safeguards are important to protect the integrity of our ef-

forts and those of many other humanitarian aid organizations. Serious health concerns for women, children and families are at stake, including unintended pregnancies which will likely increase, not reduce, the number of abortions performed on women in developing nations.

Should you have any questions on this issue, or on World Vision's position on abortion, please contact Ken Casey, Senior Vice President, in Seattle at 206-815-1000.

Sincerely,

ROBERT A. SEIPLE,

President.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. OBERSTAR], a cosponsor of our legislation, H.R. 581.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, this is put-up-or-shut-up time for those who are advocating funding for family planning without abortions. This resolution reinstates a policy that has been in effect for the past nearly a decade. Three hundred fifty organizations worldwide have accepted funds from our Government with the restrictions on abortion that we have included, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] and I have included in this language, which is the so-called Mexico City policy.

To be very clear and very simple in stating the case, in order to receive U.S. population control funds, foreign nongovernmental organizations must agree not to perform abortion, except in cases of rape, incest, or where the life of the mother is in danger; second, not to violate the laws of any foreign country with respect to abortion; or, third, not to engage in any activity or effort to alter the laws or governmental policies of any foreign country with respect to abortion.

If they really believe what they say, that they do not use abortion as a method of family planning, they do not advocate abortion, they do not perform abortions as a method of family planning, then why can they simply not agree to that language? It is straightforward, it is simple, very clear, makes a wall of separation between the reprehensible practice of abortion and, on the other hand, helping women who are in difficult circumstances in any part of the world, particularly in third world countries, to gain some measure of control over their lives.

Mr. Speaker, we have for years demonstrated the willingness of this Congress to approve funds for family planning, provided that none of those funds are used to perform abortion. In the international arena we have followed the same policy. This language that we include in our legislation, H.R. 581, makes it very clear that family planning funds may be available, but that they cannot be used to perform abortion.

There are organizations that are very intent on using abortion, counseling for abortion, working to change the laws of foreign countries on abortion. We should not use U.S. taxpayer dollars for that purpose.

I hear the arguments on the other side about the need for women to have access to family planning information, plan their lives and plan their pregnancies. That is fine. But it should not go hand in hand with abortion.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OBERSTAR. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate very much my colleague yielding. I think, as he knows, I have long been a vote in this House interested in preserving life. I feel very strongly that we ought to do all that we can to see that abortion is not used as a tool.

But could either the gentleman or our chairman answer this question for me: We do provide, from Federal coffers, a sizeable number of dollars across the country to the several States in the United States that has to do with family planning. Does the gentleman know if we require similar language and limitation upon those funds that flow to the several States of the United States?

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman, yes.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OBERSTAR. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, foreign nongovernmental organizations are not governed by the same laws that domestic nongovernmental organizations are.

Mr. LEWIS of California. I understand that.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. The Mexico City provisions were litigated. Planned Parenthood brought a suit, and they were found to be completely constitutional. Let me make a point.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, does that answer my question? Does it say that we do not allow—

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. No, we do not, because it would be construed to be unconstitutional. Otherwise, we would like to do it.

Mr. LEWIS of California. So we are essentially saying to foreign countries, you will follow a line of logic that is unconstitutional?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. We are saying where we can protect an unborn child and a generation of unborn children from aggressive lobbying by a non-governmental organization, we are going to do it. If we cannot save all of the kids, we try to save some.

To say we have to have some kind of equal policy, just because we like to say everything is the same everywhere, that to me is not productive. When we can save a child in Kenya or we can save a child in Central or South America from an assault on the law that protects them, we ought to do it.

Let me also point out to the gentleman, if the gentleman from Minnesota will continue yielding, we are talking about discretionary funding. This is not entitlement funding. We in

this Congress appropriate every year certain amounts of money to be used for this purpose. It should not be the NGOs to dictate to us that, we will not take your money unless we do this, that, and the other thing. We should put simple conditions and say, do family planning; do not permit abortions.

Mr. LEWIS of California. If the gentleman will continue to yield further, I would suggest for those who are concerned about life that we might very well consider similar limitations upon discretionary monies in this country that flow to States if they are not responding similarly, if we are serious about those limitations. I appreciate my colleague yielding to me.

Mr. OBERSTAR. As the gentleman well knows, under the Medicaid language for years that we have debated on this floor, we have had several dozen votes, maybe several hundred votes on this issue over the last 22 years that I have served here, we have imposed this restrictive language that none of the funds may be used to perform abortions.

Mr. LEWIS of California. The gentleman's last comment raises just one more point. I would certainly hope that those of us who are concerned about the life question would know that sometimes we defeat our purpose by having several hundred votes, it seems, a session, on this same issue. Many Members are reacting very strongly to that, including this Member.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. If the gentleman from Minnesota will continue to yield, the only way, because if language is silent on the Labor-HHS bill or the Federal employees health benefits program or any other program, it pays for abortion. It is incumbent upon us, those of us who do not want our tax dollars being used to subsidize abortion or the performance of it, to offer amendments. Otherwise it is used to pay for it. There is no blanket prohibition.

Mr. LEWIS of California. As my colleague can see by the vote today, sometimes that is self-defeating.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. We will be back.

Mr. OBERSTAR. To further respond to my dear friend, the gentleman from California, we would not have dozens or hundreds of votes on this subject if, in initiating programs, those who advocate family planning would stick to their last, and stick to what they believe in, and say these funds are only used for counseling, they are not used for changing people's minds about abortion, performing abortion, or advocating abortion. That is all we are asking.

Mr. LEWIS of California. I appreciate my colleague.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from California, [Mr. LEWIS] was quite correct in his line of questioning. Indeed, the Mexico City language, if it were applied in the United States, would be

unconstitutional. What we are saying with this Mexico City language, otherwise known as the gag rule, is that we will apply unconstitutional prohibitions to organizations which receive international family planning funds from the United States.

Let me be clear: No funds, and I am going to read them, because this is the existing law, and for Members who voted for the President's finding in the previous resolution, I want them to understand very clearly why the Mexico City language indeed is a gag rule, indeed is unconstitutional, and as other Members of this body have said earlier, is unnecessary.

First of all, I direct the Members' attention to the chart. Current prohibitions on use of AID funds for abortion-related activities cannot be used to pay for the performance of abortions as a method of family planning or to motivate or coerce any other person to have an abortion.

USAID funds cannot be used to lobby for or against abortion.

These funds cannot be used to purchase or distribute commodities or equipment for the purpose of inducing abortion as a method of family planning, and these funds cannot be used to support any biomedical research which relates, in whole or in part, to methods of or the performance of abortion as a method of family planning.

To make sure that this Helms language is enforced, there are very stringent safeguards in place which again I want to call to our colleagues' attention.

Strict procedures assure that no USAID funds are used for abortions, including legally binding contracts. USAID funds are provided in the context of legally binding contracts and grant agreements that include standard clauses, specifically listing prohibited activities. Violators are subject to heavy fines and loss of future AID funding.

USAID closely monitors how its funds are used through requiring detailed annual work plans, numerous detailed reports on all project activities, site visits, management reviews, and review and concurrence on project publications, and regular audits. Contracts and agreements with foreign or private organizations are subject to regular, independent audits, as defined by the Federal acquisition regulation system. USAID grantees are required to maintain extensive documentation of expenditures of foreign subcontractors who are subject to audit.

I go into this level of detail to emphasize once again that what we have proposed here today and what this House approved has nothing to do with abortion, and that the Mexico City language again would be unconstitutional in the United States. Why should we subject our grantees abroad to that gag rule, which as I say again, is unconstitutional in our country.

A couple of more points that I want to make, because comments that were

made here on the floor beg for clarification.

□ 1430

It has been repeated over and over again, certain critics of the International Planned Parenthood Federation and of government funding of international family planning programs have recently, they are stepping up this campaign citing IPPF, International Planned Parenthood Federation, as promoting abortion around the world. Let me state, the International Planned Parenthood Federation does not accept or promote abortion as a method of family planning. IPPF believes that contraception is the first line of defense against unwanted pregnancy. Access to family planning service is the most effective way to reduce abortions and the mortality caused by them. I have more information on that if Members have questions about that.

Another point that I want to reference the Smith bill, again with the greatest respect for the gentleman, in his bill, the Mexico City language, the gag rule, states that, notwithstanding any provisions of the bill, no funds appropriated for population planning activities may be used by an organization to engage in any activity or effort to alter the laws or governmental policies of any foreign countries governing the circumstances under which is permitted, regulated or prohibited.

Among other things, that is what this language does, which would change current law if it were passed and signed into law, which the President will not sign. So we have an exercise in futility at this hour of the day, and I will try to be brief. But I believe that it is necessary to protect the vote of our Members who voted in favor of the President's finding earlier.

Why are we subjecting organizations engaged in family planning internationally to conditions and standards which first of all are unconstitutional in the United States but do not apply here either? Our colleagues used the termed fungibility. If you give your money for this, it frees up your other money to do that. That is exactly what happens every time we grant a contract or a grant.

Are we subjecting the defense community to the scrutiny of its spending on what it does with its own money because they receive defense contracts from the Federal Government? The list could go on and on. It just does not seem fair to me that we should gag organizations from using their own funds for their own purposes. And if that includes making information available to women, it has nothing to do with the Federal funds that we vote in this body, and it does nothing with the constitutional approach that we take to our grantees in the United States.

What is further at issue here is this subjects that same scrutiny to the subcontractors, to these international family planning organizations. So all of this presents a gag, a hindrance, an

unnecessary encumbrance. I urge our colleagues to follow this issue closely and to reject it on this vote today, as I have said over and over again. The highest regard for the maker of the motion, this gag rule has no place in our country. It should not have any place in our funding for international family planning.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOBSON). The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] has 2½ minutes remaining, and the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI] has 6 minutes remaining. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] reserves the balance of his time and reserves the right to close.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WOOLSEY].

(Ms. WOOLSEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose this legislation, which would kill American support for the international family planning programs.

I oppose this bill for several reasons. First, it is a bill to correct a problem which does not exist. Right now, no American aid, I repeat, no American aid pays for abortions overseas.

Since 1973, Mr. Speaker, it has been illegal for American aid dollars to support abortion services in any way.

I also oppose this bill because the attempt to reinstate the Mexico City policy will have a chilling effect on family planning services. We know that the other body will not pass this legislation, and the President has vowed to veto it. This bill will only continue the current delay in services which will lead to real human misery and environmental degradation.

I want to make it clear, Mr. Speaker, that to delay is to devastate. Listen to what the National Council for International Health has had to say on this matter. They say: Last year's reduced aid for family planning is resulting in 7 million couples losing contraceptive services.

That is 7 million couples.

This will result in 4 million unwanted pregnancies. It could mean 1.6 million abortions and 8,000 maternal deaths. Passage of the Smith bill would make this worse.

Oppose this bill. Oppose further restrictions to family planning. Let us release urgently needed American aid.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GREENWOOD].

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me the time.

If the other Members of the body are like myself, they are receiving calls from their constituents who are regrettably very confused about this issue. They are calling and saying, do not vote for the President's resolution because it promotes abortion and vote for this Smith bill because it stops abortion.

And of course nothing could be further from the truth. What this is about is very simple. This is about somewhere in sub-Saharan Africa where the population rates are just crushingly explosive, there is a little clinic somewhere and that little clinic is attached to a hospital. And the clinic provides birth control so that women do not become pregnant and do not have to have abortions. But maybe 100 miles away from that hospital, abortion is legal. A woman comes in with her own money, not American taxpayers' money, and might avail herself for whatever her reasons may be of a legal abortion.

My friend, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] wants to say, then let us not give that hospital any money even to run its family planning clinic. The result of that is very, very straightforward. That little clinic out in the hinterland somewhere will not have any IUD, will not have any birth control pills. More women by the thousands will become pregnant. And where will they end up? They will end up back at that hospital, and they will be doing more abortions there than ever before.

It is time we got logical about this issue. If you are against abortion, if you want to see the number of abortions on this planet decrease, then you have to be for family planning and you have to trust the women of the world to make the right decisions.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. MALONEY].

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, Mexico City is nothing more than an international form of gag rule on providers, severely restricting the way legitimate helpful organizations use their own funds. Restricting use of money will not decrease the number of abortions performed in developing countries. Rather, lack of access to family planning facilities will likely lead to an increase in unwanted pregnancies and therefore more abortions.

We have seen in our own country how simple family planning education can work to solve problems of overpopulation and reduce the number of unplanned pregnancies. Again, family planning means education. It is not a means of doling out abortion dollars across the globe.

This gag rule has no place in this debate, and I urge my colleagues not to give in to these tactics. I urge a vote against the Smith bill.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time, to thank our colleagues on both sides of the aisle and both sides of the issue for this, I think, productive debate this afternoon. All of the participation, the full participation of Members, I think, has been very helpful to us. But I want to use my remaining moments to thank and acknowledge the staff for their hard work on this issue. From the staff of the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY], Matt Traub and Sharon Levin; Lissa Topel from the

staff of the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAUNO]; Kara Haas, Judy Borger, Mark Kirk, Terri McCullough, Leslie Patykewich, from my own staff, Carolyn Bartholomew; and from the subcommittee, Mark Murray, Scott Lilley. As always the staff is the great untold story of Congress. They are a tremendous resource to us. They work so hard, and I wanted to give them this recognition on a day when we are debating this very, very important legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I just say once again, let us not hold the children, the poor children of the world hostage to congressional politics. Vote "no" on the Smith amendment.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, let me just say again, nobody is holding this policy or family planning hostage to congressional politics. This has everything to do with the deep-seated and very strongly held belief that every human life is precious, born and unborn. We cannot and should never facilitate a policy that puts the unborn at risk of being killed by abortion on demand.

Let me also make the point, a clarification: We have heard on the other side how this is somehow a gag rule. The gag rule is a word that was coined during the title X debate dealing with abortion counseling. Abortion counseling is not covered by the Mexico City policy. It was not during the years that it was in effect, and I am amazed how that disinformation continues to persist both in the media as well as by Members who have been offering up positions on the other side of this issue.

Let me also point out, we do not concede that Mexico City policy would be unconstitutional if applied to United States domestic organizations. But a decision was made in the Reagan administration years ago, and it was fully litigated, that foreign nongovernmental organizations would be the ones that would be affected, and it was upheld by the U.S. Supreme Court.

Finally, let me say that H.R. 581 is pro-life but it is also pro-family planning. One of the speakers on the other side was bemoaning the delay. OK, let us end the delay. Let us get all \$385 million plus the 25 million for the UNFPA out the door by March 1. Only the Smith-Oberstar-Hyde bill does that. So if money delayed is money denied, our bill gets the money there sooner rather than later. But it does so in a principled way. It says that we are for family planning but we are not for abortion.

Let me also point out again who we subsidize does matter. We should not compartmentalize our view and say if they do this with our money that is OK and who gives a darn what else they do with the rest of their money. Abortion is child abuse. It kills babies. It is a violent act. Let us face that reality.

The partial birth abortion ban fight last year at least began forcing all of



us to look at abortion for what it truly is and at the methods of abortion for the cruelty that they represent toward children.

Who we subsidize does matter. The IPPF based in London, International Planned Parenthood Federation, has a strategic plan. They make no bones about it. It is right here in black and white. They want abortion on demand in every country of the world. They have action plans for every country of the world. Vote yes on H.R. 581.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 581, a resolution which would prevent American international family planning funds from being used to actively support abortion as a preferred method of family planning.

The majority of my constituents and I believe that the taking of a life is totally unacceptable, and we do not support funding for organizations which support abortion services. Taking a life is a deplorable act, one which carries grave consequences in our justice system. How do we reconcile our system of punishing murderers with providing funding to foreign organizations which support abortion?

H.R. 581 also includes provisions which would ensure that American aid will not support organizations which work to modify existing policies regarding abortion in foreign nations, as well as organizations which disobey foreign nations' laws relating to abortion.

Family planning is the goal of these funds, and there are alternate methods of family planning which do not condemn a life. By supporting H.R. 581, the United States can still be at the vanguard of family planning programs without advocating abortion as an option.

I urge my colleagues to lend their support for H.R. 581. Everyone knows that the taking of a life is wrong, let us not show the world that the United States not only accepts murder as a form of family planning but actively funds organizations who support it.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to support Congressman SMITH's bill to make sure that agencies receiving international family planning funds do not use these funds to promote abortion. Many Americans believe that their taxes do not support abortion overseas, but they have been terribly misled. Their money is distributed generously to groups who actively encourage abortion, seek to overturn foreign countries abortion laws, and support programs which are tainted by forced abortion and sterilization of women policies.

Although I do question the necessity of releasing these funds early, what is really at issue here is how the Clinton administration chooses to distribute these funds. In 1993, President Clinton overturned the Reagan-Bush era policy which prohibited U.S. financial support for international organizations that either promote or perform abortions as a means of birth control. I find it morally unjust to require U.S. taxpayers to support the global proliferation of abortion.

Instead of filling clinics overseas with abortion-related equipment, the United States should stock the shelves with lifesaving drugs which will help to save the 2.1 million children—according to UNICEF—who die each year from vaccine-preventable diseases.

The Smith legislation would allow the release of family planning funds early, as the administration has requested. However, it

would stop rewarding international organizations that promote and perform abortions with American taxpayer dollars—which is exactly why the President has threatened to veto the Smith bill and thereby eliminate any possibility of an early release of these funds.

Yes, the administration has never hidden its support for both international family-planning services and abortion. The two are clearly not the same. I urge my colleagues to support the Smith bill and make that distinction absolutely clear.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, as a strong supporter of family planning initiatives, I would like to emphasize my support for the U.S. International Family Planning Program. This program has been extremely effective in protecting the health and lives of women and children in underdeveloped and developing countries throughout the world.

Today, I will be voting for H.R. 581 which was introduced by Representative CHRIS SMITH. For those who claim to be true supporters of our family planning efforts overseas, I believe this is the correct vote to cast. H.R. 581 will release the full \$385 million in international family planning money on March 1, 1997—bringing the total fiscal year 1997 spending on these programs to \$713 million. In other words, this bill will provide nearly \$200 million more in funding than the resolution which was passed by the House earlier today (H.J. Res. 36). In addition, it will ensure that this Federal funding is used only for contraceptive family planning and health care services, not abortion.

As a supporter of family planning, whether it be international or national initiatives, I believe we need to examine how the United States can best support true family planning efforts. Clearly, if we are talking only about family planning and contraception, rather than abortion, then the Smith bill before us would provide substantially more funding for health care services and have a greater impact on low-income women and children abroad. Supporting H.R. 581 will ensure that we provide the maximum amount of international family planning money available, while at the same time ensuring that U.S. tax dollars are not used to provide or promote abortion.

I encourage my colleagues to join me in voting "yes" on this important legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 46, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the

ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 231, nays 194, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 23]

YEAS—231

Aderholt	Gillmor	Oberstar
Archer	Goode	Ortiz
Armey	Goodlatte	Oxley
Bachus	Goodling	Packard
Baker	Goss	Pappas
Ballenger	Graham	Parker
Barcia	Granger	Paxon
Barr	Gutknecht	Pease
Barrett (NE)	Hall (OH)	Peterson (MN)
Bartlett	Hall (TX)	Peterson (PA)
Barton	Hamilton	Petri
Bateman	Hansen	Pickering
Bereuter	Hastert	Pitts
Berry	Hastings (WA)	Pombo
Bilbray	Hayworth	Porter
Bilirakis	Hefley	Portman
Bliley	Herger	Poshard
Blunt	Hill	Quinn
Boehner	Hilleary	Radanovich
Bonilla	Hoekstra	Rahall
Bonior	Holden	Regula
Bono	Hostettler	Riggs
Borski	Hulshof	Riley
Brady	Hunter	Roemer
Bryant	Hutchinson	Rogan
Bunning	Hyde	Rogers
Burr	Inglis	Rohrabacher
Burton	Istook	Ros-Lehtinen
Buyer	Jenkins	Royce
Callahan	John	Ryun
Calvert	Johnson, Sam	Salmon
Camp	Jones	Sanford
Canady	Kanjorski	Saxton
Cannon	Kasich	Scarborough
Chabot	Kildee	Schaffer, Dan
Chambliss	Kim	Schaffer, Bob
Chenoweth	King (NY)	Sensenbrenner
Christensen	Kingston	Sessions
Coble	Klink	Shadegg
Coburn	Knollenberg	Shaw
Collins	Kucinich	Shimkus
Combest	LaHood	Shuster
Cook	Largent	Skeen
Cooksey	Latham	Skelton
Costello	LaTourette	Smith (MI)
Cox	Lewis (CA)	Smith (NJ)
Cramer	Lewis (KY)	Smith (OR)
Crane	Linder	Smith (TX)
Crapo	Lipinski	Smith, Linda
Cubin	Livingston	Snowbarger
Cunningham	LoBiondo	Solomon
Danner	Lucas	Souder
Davis (VA)	Manton	Spence
Deal	Manzullo	Stearns
DeLay	Mascara	Stenholm
Diaz-Balart	McCollum	Stump
Dickey	McCrery	Stupak
Doolittle	McDade	Sununu
Doyle	McHugh	Talent
Dreier	McInnis	Tauzin
Duncan	McIntosh	Taylor (MS)
Dunn	McIntyre	Taylor (NC)
Ehlers	McKeon	Thornberry
Ehrlich	McNulty	Thune
Emerson	Metcalf	Tiahrt
English	Mica	Walsh
Ensign	Miller (FL)	Wamp
Everett	Moakley	Watkins
Ewing	Mollohan	Watts (OK)
Foley	Moran (KS)	Weldon (FL)
Forbes	Murtha	Weldon (PA)
Fowler	Myrick	Weller
Fox	Nethercutt	Weygand
Galleghy	Neumann	Whitfield
Ganske	Ney	Wicker
Gekas	Northup	Wolf
Gibbons	Norwood	Young (FL)

NAYS—194

Abercrombie	Baessler	Becerra
Ackerman	Baldacci	Bentsen
Allen	Barrett (WI)	Berman
Andrews	Bass	Bishop

Blagojevich	Hefner	Pastor
Blumenauer	Hilliard	Paul
Boehkert	Hinchey	Payne
Boswell	Hinojosa	Pelosi
Boucher	Hobson	Pickett
Boyd	Hooley	Pomeroy
Brown (CA)	Horn	Price (NC)
Brown (FL)	Houghton	Pryce (OH)
Brown (OH)	Hoyer	Ramstad
Campbell	Jackson (IL)	Rangel
Capps	Jackson-Lee	Reyes
Cardin	(TX)	Rivers
Castle	Jefferson	Rothman
Clayton	Johnson (CT)	Roukema
Clement	Johnson (WI)	Roybal-Allard
Clyburn	Johnson, E. B.	Rush
Condit	Kaptur	Sabo
Conyers	Kelly	Sanchez
Coyne	Kennedy (MA)	Sanders
Cummings	Kennedy (RI)	Sandlin
Davis (FL)	Kennelly	Sawyer
Davis (IL)	Kilpatrick	Schiff
DeFazio	Kind (WI)	Schumer
DeGette	Klecza	Scott
Delahunt	Klug	Serrano
DeLauro	Kolbe	Shays
Dellums	Lampson	Sherman
Deutsch	Lantos	Sisisky
Dicks	Lazio	Skaggs
Dingell	Leach	Slaughter
Dixon	Levin	Smith, Adam
Doggett	Lewis (GA)	Snyder
Dooley	Lofgren	Spratt
Edwards	Lowey	Stabenow
Engel	Luther	Stark
Eshoo	Maloney (CT)	Stokes
Etheridge	Maloney (NY)	Strickland
Evans	Markey	Tanner
Farr	Martinez	Tauscher
Fattah	Matsui	Thomas
Fawell	McCarthy (MO)	Thompson
Fazio	McCarthy (NY)	Thurman
Filner	McDermott	Tierney
Flake	McGovern	Torres
Foglietta	McHale	Towns
Ford	McKinney	Trafficant
Frank (MA)	Meehan	Turner
Franks (NJ)	Meek	Upton
Frelinghuysen	Menendez	Velazquez
Frost	Millender	Vento
Furse	McDonald	Visclosky
Gejdenson	Miller (CA)	Waters
Gephardt	Minge	Watt (NC)
Gilchrest	Molinari	Waxman
Gilman	Moran (VA)	Wexler
Gonzalez	Morella	White
Gordon	Nadler	Wise
Green	Neal	Woolsey
Greenwood	Olver	Wynn
Gutierrez	Owens	Yates
Harman	Pallone	
Hastings (FL)	Pascrell	

## NOT VOTING—7

Carson	Mink	Young (AK)
Clay	Nussle	
LaFalce	Obey	

□ 1502

The Clerk announced the following pair:

Mr. LAFALCE for with Mrs. CARSON against.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. BOB SCHAFFER of Colorado, HUNTER, McDADE and EHRLICH changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

# EXPRESSING APPRECIATION FOR THE LIFE AND SERVICE OF AM- BASSADOR PAMELA C. HAR- RIMAN

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on International Relations be dis-

charged from further consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 49) expressing appreciation for the life and service of Ambassador Pamela C. Harriman, and I ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCINNIS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I do not intend to object, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] for an explanation of the resolution.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Indiana for yielding. I have just been informed by the leadership that there will be no further votes today.

Mr. Speaker, it is with both sadness and gratefulness that I ask the House to adopt this resolution concerning the recent passing away of a great American, Ambassador Pamela C. Harriman. Her sudden death last week left all Americans bereft of a truly dedicated public servant, a woman of wide learning and interest and a great patriot. It is only fitting that on this day that our Nation pays tribute to Ambassador Harriman, that we too mark her passing and remember her life.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that all of our Members will join with the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANZULLO] and myself, acting on behalf of our Committee on International Relations, in putting the House of Representatives on record in appreciation of Ambassador Pamela Harriman's life.

We should bear in mind that as a wife she provided her wisdom and solace during the last years of his life to one of the great statesmen of this century, New York's Governor Averell Harriman. We should also take note of her contribution to the Allied victory over Nazism in Europe through her earliest exploits in the field of diplomacy, helping to unite as allies the nations of France, Great Britain, and the United States. In her capacity as a United States Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to France, Pamela Harriman gave the last measure of her life to serving our Nation, her adopted country. She brought to this task all of her skills and experience in keeping the ties between our Nation and France strong despite many troublesome disagreements between our nations. She was very much a hands-on Ambassador, working long hours, devoting substantial energy to this task.

Although this resolution has not been formally considered in our Committee on International Relations, we did have a discussion on the matter on February 4 at our committee's organizational meeting which happened to occur on the day of Ambassador Harriman's passing away. At that meeting, our committee agreed to a unanimous consent request propounded by the gen-

tleman from Illinois [Mr. MANZULLO] setting out essentially the wording and noting our support for moving a resolution noting such sentiments on the floor. I wish to commend the gentleman from Illinois for his strong interest in making certain that this matter was considered in a timely and an appropriate manner.

Mr. Speaker, for all of these reasons, I believe that support of this resolution is merited, and I hope that all of the Members will join with us in recognizing Pamela Harriman as a distinguished stateswoman and a great American.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I want to join the distinguished chairman of the House International Relations Committee in expressing appreciation for the life of a great public servant, Ambassador Pamela C. Harriman.

She became an American by choice and devoted herself to the betterment of her adopted country. As the Ambassador of the United States to France, she worked tirelessly to build closer relations between the United States and its oldest ally. She was a renowned woman of grace, wit, charm, intellect, and boundless energy.

On this day of a memorial service at the National Cathedral for Ambassador Harriman, it is altogether fitting that the House of Representatives take up and pass this resolution commemorating a great American. I join the chairman in congratulating the distinguished gentleman from Illinois for sponsoring this resolution.

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAMILTON. Further reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a great American Ambassador, Pamela C. Harriman. Sadly, Ambassador Harriman passed away earlier this month in Paris. Throughout her life she worked tirelessly in service to her adopted country, the United States. Most recently she served as U.S. Ambassador to France, from 1993 to early 1997, where she helped strengthen Franco-American ties while expertly handling such difficult and complex issues as NATO expansion, the Middle East peace process, the role of the U.N. and multilateral trade.

How appropriate for Ambassador Harriman's career to take her to Paris, for as a young woman she endeavored to strengthen ties between Great Britain, the United States and France in the Allies fight against Nazi aggression. Before assuming her diplomatic duties in Paris, Pamela Harriman sought to enrich the lives of all Americans through her many efforts in the fields of politics and arts. She was also the wife and friend of Governor Averell Harriman, one of our country's great statesmen.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to join with me in supporting House Resolution 49 to express our heartfelt thanks for the life and service of Pamela Harriman and to convey our condolences and deepest sympathies to the Harriman family.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAMILTON. Further reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I thank the distinguished gentleman for yielding. We all appreciate his leadership in the international role that this country plays.

To Ambassador Harriman, I am delighted to be able to say that she chose America. She chose America. She is certainly an international figure and a child of the world.

□ 1515

We are delighted in her multicultural background, that she chose to adopt this country as her native land. She had her own values, but I can believe that she truly is one that believed in democracy, for in all of her activities she was involved in creating greater opportunities for democracy. She believed in diversity. She helped all of those who wanted to have a piece of the pie, and certainly, as she rose to the Ambassadorship of France, appointed by President William Clinton, she made Americans proud. And not only did she make us proud, she provided us and encouraged us to engage in peace.

My hat is off, my heart goes out to the family of Ambassador Harriman, and what I will say is that we will truly miss her but she is a grand lady, and she is truly a great American.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI].

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

I too want to rise to pay tribute to Ambassador to France Pamela Harriman. As I said earlier today, many of us in this body would love to have been at her funeral service today to give thanksgiving and to celebrate her great life, but duty called and we had to be on the floor for our legislation. Pamela would have understood that, committed to duty as she was.

I said in my 1 minute this morning, and I will repeat now, that in this body we have only two portraits. One is of George Washington, the father of our country; the other is of the Marquis de Lafayette, a friend of our independence, demonstrating our closeness to France. It was fitting then that we sent France our finest in the person of Pamela Harriman as our Ambassador.

I know it is a source of great pride to her family that she was eulogized by the President of France and given by him the highest honor that country can bestow. I know it was a source of great pride that she was eulogized by

the President of the United States and mourned by the First Family. I hope it is a comfort to Pamela's family that many in this body and in our great country mourn their loss, our loss.

To Pamela: Adieu, thank you and love.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCINNIS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

#### H. RES. 49

Whereas Pamela C. Harriman served her country ably as United States Ambassador to France from 1993 to early 1997;

Whereas during her tenure as ambassador Pamela Harriman worked tirelessly to bring closer together as strong allies and friends the United States and France;

Whereas Pamela Harriman worked throughout her adult life in the fields of politics and the arts, enriching the lives of all who knew her and all Americans;

Whereas during the Second World War Pamela Harriman endeavored to solidify relations among Britain, the United States, and France, contributing her knowledge and her efforts to making the alliance against Nazism a success;

Whereas as a wife and friend she gave strength and wise counsel to one of the great United States statesmen of this century, Governor Averell Harriman; and

Whereas until the very end of her life she was renowned as a woman of grace, wit, and charm: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Members of the House of Representatives—

(1) are grateful for the life and service of this great American; and

(2) join in conveying their condolences and deepest sympathies to the members of the family of Ambassador Pamela C. Harriman.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the resolution just agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

#### ELECTION AS MEMBERS TO CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Democratic caucus, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 58) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

#### H. RES. 58

*Resolved*, That the following-named Members be, and that they are hereby, elected to

the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

To the Committee on Commerce: Frank Pallone of New Jersey to rank directly above Sherrod Brown of Ohio.

To the Committee on Resources: Ron Kind of Wisconsin.

To the Committee on Science: Ralph Hall, Texas; Bart Gordon, Tennessee; James A. Traficant, Jr., Ohio; Tim Roemer, Indiana; Robert E. (Bud) Cramer, Jr., Alabama; James A. Barcia, Michigan; Paul McHale, Pennsylvania; Eddie Bernice Johnson, Texas; Alcee Hastings, Florida; Lynn Rivers, Michigan; Zoe Lofgren, California; Lloyd Doggett, Texas; Michael Doyle, Pennsylvania; Sheila Jackson-Lee, Texas; Bill Luther, Minnesota; Walter Capps, California; Debbie Stabenow, Michigan; Bob Etheridge, North Carolina; Nick Lampson, Texas; Darlene Hooley, Oregon.

Mr. FAZIO of California (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

#### AUTHORIZING THE SPEAKER TO DECLARE A RECESS ON THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 1997, TO RECEIVE HIS EXCELLENCY EDUARDO FREI, PRESIDENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF CHILE

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order anytime on Thursday, February 27, 1997, for the Speaker to declare a recess, subject to the call of the chair, for the purpose of receiving in joint meeting his Excellency, Eduardo Frei, President of the Republic of Chile.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

#### HOUR OF MEETING ON THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 1997

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Wednesday, February 26, 1997, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. on Thursday, February 27.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

# GRANTING MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE PRIVILEGE TO EXTEND THEIR REMARKS IN CONGRESSIONAL RECORD TODAY

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that for today all Members be permitted to extend their remarks and to include extraneous material in the section of the RECORD entitled "Extension of Remarks."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

# AUTHORIZING SPEAKER, MAJORITY LEADER AND MINORITY LEADER TO ACCEPT RESIGNATIONS AND TO MAKE APPOINTMENTS NOTWITHSTANDING ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding any adjournment of the House until Tuesday, February 25, 1997, the Speaker, majority leader and minority leader be authorized to accept resignations and to make appointments authorized by law or by the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

# PERMISSION FOR SPEAKER TO APPOINT MEMBERS TO REPRESENT THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AT CEREMONIES FOR THE OBSERVANCE OF GEORGE WASHINGTON'S BIRTHDAY

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it shall be in order for the Speaker to appoint 2 Members of the House, one upon the recommendation of the minority leader, to represent the House of Representatives at appropriate ceremonies for the observance of George Washington's birthday to be held on Thursday, February 20, 1997.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

# DESIGNATION OF THE HON. CONSTANCE A. MORELLA TO ACT AS SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS THROUGH FEBRUARY 25, 1997.

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, February 13, 1997.

I hereby designate the Honorable Constance A. Morella to act as Speaker pro tempore to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions through February 25, 1997.

NEWT GINGRICH,  
Speaker of the  
House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the designation is agreed to.

There was no objection.

## SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

## TRIBUTE TO DR. TIMOTHY WINTERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. FILNER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, colleagues, I rise today in celebration of Black History Month and to recognize a truly remarkable leader from my 50th Congressional District in San Diego.

In the Rev. Dr. Timothy Winters, we find a man who has dedicated his life to the spiritual well-being of many of our neighborhoods in San Diego. In addition to being pastor of the Bayview Baptist Church, one of the largest churches in San Diego, he also holds the position as president of the Baptist Ministers Union. While in this position, Dr. Winters is shown to be a very capable leader in guiding his church and a ministerial organization to success and high achievement. He was instrumental in building of the Martin Luther King School, complete with meeting halls and banquet facilities.

Dr. Winters is also an accomplished speaker, often called to speak on various problems and concerns of the African-American community and the city at large. He lectures frequently on the matters of consumer awareness and debt-free living. His workshops and finance seminars, which he often conducts from various churches, have helped to improve the lives of literally thousands who have heeded his advice and counsel.

I am also proud of the many fair lending agreements that Dr. Winters assisted in forging with the many banks and financial institutions in our city.

The accolades for Dr. Winters go far beyond the African-American community. His writings and teachings are celebrated nationwide. And, at a gala evening of celebration, the city of San Diego will honor this individual of such energy. He has often been a great inspiration to me, and I look forward to working with Dr. Winters to raise the quality of life in our community.

Please join me in celebrating the great contributions and achievement made to the constituents of the 50th Congressional District by Dr. Timothy Winters.

## SOCIAL SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, it was interesting in the Committee on the Budget this morning that Dr. June O'Neill, the Director of the Congressional Budget Office, came with their analysis of the President's budget. One of the conclusions of the CBO was that the President's budget is not going to be in the surplus by the year 2002, but under their projections will run a \$50 billion deficit in the year 2002. So I would ask that we make a humble, respectful request to the President to resubmit a budget that balances by the Congressional Budget Office scoring.

Another thing that Dr. O'Neill said was that if we continue spending the way we are today, we need an immediate 50-percent increase in income tax rates to keep the budget in balance. If we put off any decision until the year 2017, we would have to have an 87-percent increase in the income tax. That means that families' take-home pay would be cut in half, and what they can spend on health care and on clothes and on food and on transportation would end up being cut in half.

I want to quickly give a presentation of what is happening in what has become the largest spending item, and that is Social Security. As you see by this chart, Social Security now takes up 22 percent of the Federal budget. And what has happened is Congress, I would suggest, made a mistake by requiring everybody to contribute to Social Security, and not putting any of that money in savings and investment. Instead, since it started in 1935, Social Security has been a pay-as-you-go program where existing workers pay in their taxes to support the benefits of existing retirees.

If I get my charts correct, this shows what is going to happen to Social Security if we make no changes, and that is that there is going to be less money coming in in this pay-as-you-go program. In 2011, Dorcas Hardy, a former commissioner, says there is going to be less tax money coming into Social Security than is required for the payouts as early as 2005. That's not very far in the future. So if we are going to preserve Social Security not only for future retirees but for existing retirees, we simply got to start taking our heads out of the sand and be willing to face this very tough question on what we're going to do to preserve Social Security, to preserve Medicare, to preserve some of the important programs that Government has developed to help people, and not put the burden on future generations and ask them to pay an 87-percent increase in their taxes.

Here is the problem on Social Security. It was developed as a pay-as-you-go system where existing workers pay for existing retirees. But what has happened is there are fewer workers paying for the support of that retiree.

In 1950, we had 17 workers earning money, paying their taxes to support each retiree. Today, there are three workers. In another 35 years there are going to be only two workers working

and paying the taxes to support each retiree.

Now here is what the average retired couple has already gotten back: Over four times what they and their employer put into the Social Security taxes, plus compound interest. This chart shows that if you happened to retire in 1940, it took just 2 months to get everything back that you and your employer put into Social Security taxes. If you retired in 1960, it took 2 years.

Look what is going to happen to the workers that are starting to retire today, to the workers that are 35 and 45 and 50 years old. They are going to have to work 26 years after retirement. They are going to have to live 26 years after retirement in order to collect the benefits that they and their employer put into Social Security. We have got to have a change.

I have developed a proposal that I think we should run up the flagpole in order to start coming up with solutions to save Social Security. My proposal allows some private investment, but at the same time does not take away benefits from anybody over 58 years old.

□ 1530

So I think we have to tell people ahead of time what is happening. Part of the solution is a private investment. Part of the solution is slowing down benefits for the higher income recipients.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that we deal with these serious problems as soon as possible and not put it off for another decade.

#### SPECIAL ATTENTION TO THE CAPITAL OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from the District of Columbia [Ms. NORTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor today first and foremost to thank the leadership of this country for the priority they have placed upon the capital of the United States, to thank President Bill Clinton, majority leader of the Senate TRENT LOTT, and our own Speaker, NEWT GINGRICH, who have agreed that among the five priorities for this session of Congress should be special attention to the capital of the United States. There is there the kind of bipartisanship that one would expect from a great country for its great capital.

Why this priority for the capital of the United States? Well, I suppose its name tells it all. It is the capital of the United States, and there is in this body and this country a fiduciary obligation to its own capital. It is self-evident. The District of Columbia is a financial orphan under our Constitution. It is not a part of any State. It cannot even tax people who come here from other regions, use our services and go home without leaving any, not even one thin dime of tax money here.

Why has the city come to this state of affairs now? Well, all of the cities are in great trouble, but they have States. There is not a big city in the United States that would not be flat on its back if it were not for its State. Cities are increasingly clusters of the poor, with the middle class having fled.

This chart tells the story of the death-dealing crisis of your capital city. We are on line to lose three times as many people in the 1990's as we lost in the 1980's. If we mean to have a capital, now is the time to move in. This is the session of Congress to move in to help the city.

The reason this has not been as apparent as it should be is that the District Government has been historically poorly managed. That hides the poor performance of the Congress and of the country. The poor performance of the city should not give rise to the abandonment of the capital by our country.

And what about the performance of the Congress, which offloaded \$5 billion in pension liability built up before home rule? What about a Congress that says to a city in this day and time, hey, you pay for State functions, prisons, Medicaid, courts, all by yourself with no help from anyone else? It cannot be done, my good colleagues. And yet there are no sure and fast answers to the problems of the District.

I went this week to the funeral of a brave young officer, Officer Brian Gibson, executed, and I come back the day of his funeral to find a Member of the other body wanting to put the death penalty on the District of Columbia. This is 4 years after the District faced this issue and voted that it would be among the jurisdictions not to have the death penalty.

The top killing States in the United States all have the death penalty. We do not see the death penalty as the answer to the crime problems of the District of Columbia. We do note that the American Bar Association says that the death penalty is so inequitably applied that there should be a moratorium on it.

We ask the help of our country. We are prepared to make, and are making, excruciating sacrifices that no city which has gotten into trouble has had to make, that New York and that Philadelphia, which all became insolvent years before the District, none had to make, because there was a State.

We are asking for the help of our country. We believe that the half-million people who live in the District deserve the help of our country. But please do not impose on us matters that we ourselves have not approved. This is yet a free country, and this is the Congress that boasts that it is devolving power back to the localities, not usurping power from the localities.

I welcome the help of my colleagues. I look forward to working with the President, with the majority leader of the Senate, with the Speaker of the House, and with my own leadership to

make the capital of the United States a city that we truly can all be proud of.

#### THE COMMON SENSE CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM ACT OF 1997

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KNOLLENBERG] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, the fundraising scandals of the 1996 Presidential election have moved campaign finance reform to the front burner of the agenda for the 105th Congress. Things like the ever-expanding influence of special and large contributions from non-U.S. citizens have eroded the public's confidence in our democratic process and left far too many Americans demoralized and in fact disenfranchised.

At the same time, while the level of attention has increased significantly in just the last few months, most observers agree that the chances of passing a comprehensive overhaul of our campaign finance system in this Congress remain very, very slim. I happen to agree with that assessment.

Currently, we have a Democrat in the White House, we have the Republicans in control of both Houses. Asking us to pass a comprehensive bill now would be like asking two football teams to overhaul the rules of the game while it is being played.

Instead, I believe that we should take a series of incremental steps toward reform and correcting the most glaring and immediate problems of the current system, while leaving the larger issues to a time when the chances of passing a comprehensive bill are more realistic.

I rise today to introduce what I believe should be the first step: the Common Sense Campaign Finance Reform Act of 1997. This bill is designed to remedy the most pressing problems, and I say again, the most pressing problems of our current system, namely, the influx of special interest and foreign money into the Nation's campaign coffers.

First, and this chart I think says it all very well, my bill would require that House and Senate candidates limit their PAC contributions to 35 percent, as represented by this graph.

Second, there is a limit on outside donors. Candidates can raise no more than 35 percent of their individual contributions, I am talking about individual contributions, from donors who live outside their districts for House Members or outside the State for Senators. Then finally, limit foreign money. Candidates may not accept contributions from people who are ineligible to vote. So one, two, three; it is very simple.

This would address the concerns raised by the amount of money that came from non-U.S. citizens during the 1996 election, and it would also, I think, crack down on efforts to circumvent individual contribution limits

by funneling money through the children of rich donors.

Mr. Speaker, I firmly believe that if we try to swallow campaign finance reform whole instead of taking smaller bites, we ultimately choke. Instead, we should adopt what I believe this is, a more realistic and commonsense approach to focus on getting the job done. That is what I think the American people want, and that is what my bill offers. Again, three steps, if the camera can pick this up, one, two, and three, that is all there is to it, but it goes a long way, I believe, toward commonsense reform, reform we can do now. I urge my colleagues to become cosponsors.

#### THE HONG KONG REVERSION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, in less than 5 months nearly a century of British rule will end and Hong Kong will become a special administrative region of China. Nobody knows exactly what will happen in Hong Kong on that night or in ensuing months and years. This reversion is unprecedented in its complexity.

Hong Kong, one of the world's most efficient economies, will become part of an emerging giant that has yet to integrate itself fully into the world economy and the international community and which has only begun to experiment with democracy at the village level.

The United Kingdom and the People's Republic of China have largely agreed upon the basic rules for Hong Kong's reversion in the Sino-British Joint Declaration of 1984. For its part, China has agreed to grant Hong Kong more autonomy than international law requires.

In Hong Kong's Constitution, the basic law of 1989, the National People's Congress unveiled a one-country, two-system arrangement for 50 years. During that time, Hong Kong is supposed to enjoy a high degree of autonomy, except in the areas of foreign affairs and defense.

It is rumored that over 7,000 journalists from around the world will be on hand at midnight on June 30, 1997, to witness the official handover. Presumably those journalists will be there to observe whether the transition goes smoothly. Already the press coverage in Hong Kong has become intense.

In large part, the attention focused on Hong Kong by the international press has been fueled by misguided or heavy-handed efforts by the Chinese Government to disband the current legislative council and replace it with the provisional legislature, to alter civil rights protections in Hong Kong, and to improperly influence the extremely efficient and extraordinarily important civil service of Hong Kong.

Today, with a number of colleagues, I am introducing the Hong Kong Rever-

sion Act that will aid Congress in wading through all of the important issues and this complex transition by building on the Hong Kong Policy Act of 1992. It will require assessments and reports by the Secretary of State in very specific areas so that the President can determine whether to maintain current United States law and policies involving Hong Kong.

In addition, I am especially pleased to report that a team of specialists from the Library of Congress, led by Kerry Dumbaugh, has, at my request, just completed an excellent comprehensive report entitled "Hong Kong's Reversion to China: Implications for the United States." This excellent report will also greatly assist the Congress in this important task, so I am allowing the Library of Congress to make this report publicly available today.

Mr. Speaker, this Member invites the cosponsorship and support of this legislation by any and all of my colleagues. Original cosponsors include the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON], the gentleman from California [Mr. BERMAN], the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BARRETT], the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER], the gentleman from American Samoa [Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CRANE], the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE], and the gentleman from California [Mr. COX].

#### TRIBUTE TO THE PEOPLE OF LITHUANIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SHIMKUS] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the people of Lithuania, who, through tireless perseverance, are celebrating their independence on Sunday, February 16.

Referred to as the crossroads of Europe, with the geographical center of Europe just to the north of the capital of Vilnius, Lithuania is a fascinating and diverse country rich in history and tradition. I am proud to be a descendant of a Lithuanian immigrant to the United States. My great grandfather, Casper Shimkus, came to this country in hopes of finding the American Dream. It is my pleasure to carry on his name and his Lithuanian heritage, a heritage strong in work ethic, personal responsibility, and the ability to overcome adversity.

As Americans, there are certain rights we take for granted, all of which can be found in our Bill of Rights. Lithuanians have struggled for these rights, a struggle which has expanded the centuries.

Since the founding of the first Lithuanian state in 1236, Lithuania has

been occupied by czarist Russia for a majority of the time, an occupation which lasted continuously from 1795 to 1915. During that time, the people of Lithuania were subjected to many hardships, including being unable to use the Latin alphabet, lack of religious freedom, and desecration of their cultural identity.

With the collapse of czarist Russia at the end of World War I, Lithuanians took advantage of the opportunity to regain their independence. On February 16, 1918, the Lithuanian National Council met and declared the restoration of Lithuania's independence. After defending itself against foreign armies traveling across the territory after the war, by the early 1920's Lithuania was a free nation rebuilding its own political culture and economic life.

This freedom was short-lived for the Lithuanian people. On August 23, 1939, the Soviet Union and Nazi Germany entered into a pact which placed Lithuania in the Soviets' sphere of influence. On June 15, 1940, in violation of international law, the Soviet Union invaded Lithuania. The occupation by the Soviet Union lasted for about 1 year until Nazi Germany forced the Soviets out and then occupied this country.

□ 1545

It was during the next 3 years of Nazi occupation that most of Lithuania's 200,000 Jewish citizens were murdered. After the fall of Nazi Germany, the Soviets stepped in and again occupied Lithuania. However, the idea of an independent Lithuania never died. In the late 1980's, as changes were taking place throughout the Soviet Union, Lithuanians organized a powerful independence movement.

After four decades of suppression of their culture and heritage, the Lithuanian people rose up in peaceful protest. The continued protest and push for independence finally culminated in 1990, with proindependence candidates winning a clear majority in elections to the Parliament of the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic. On March 11, 1990, the reestablishment of an independent Lithuanian State was proclaimed. After a final, unsuccessful coup attempt by a few Soviet military units in 1991, Lithuania took its rightful place in the international community as a vibrant, independent country.

Now led by a parliamentary democracy, the determined Lithuanian people are beginning to feel the full benefits of freedom, religious freedom, a taste of democracy, and movement toward an effective free market economy. The United States must lend its full support to not only Lithuania, but to all the Baltic States now. This is not the time for our administration to waver on its position toward the Baltics.

With the instability of the political situation in Russia, it is in the long-term interest of the United States to promote democracy and free markets

in the region, in hopes that it may counteract possible instability. It is now time for the United States to recognize the struggle the Lithuanians have had for freedom and democracy, and support these brave people for their determination and moral principles they exemplify, rather than sidestep the issue so that we do not jeopardize our relationship with Russia.

At this time, Lithuania is looking for an invitation for at least one Baltic country in the first round of NATO enlargement at the Madrid summit this July. This invitation would promote an alliance between Western ideas and the Baltic region, providing security so that the Baltic States may continue with their pro-Democratic reforms.

As Americans in the post-cold-war era, we all should be trying to promote peace, democracy, and free-market enterprise in the region, which could be achieved with the NATO expansion, including part of the Baltic States. It is for these reasons that I am a strong supporter of the concurrent resolution offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], recommending the integration of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania into NATO.

Most of all, Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate all Lithuanians on their independence, and ask that my colleagues join in supporting this proud Nation. The fate of their liberty now rests on the determination of the Lithuanian people to preserve and protect a democratic government. As Americans, we should not only congratulate this country for their newly emerging democracy, but support their efforts to become a member of NATO.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. COX].

Mr. COX of California. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join with my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois, and with my other colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives, in recognizing Lithuanian Independence Day this Sunday.

Lithuanian independence, of course, is not something that the people of Lithuania and the people of the free world won from the Soviet Union. It is something that Lithuania declared for itself 79 years ago, in 1918. What Lithuania did in my lifetime, and something in which I am proud to have participated, was to reassert successfully that independence, to do so at a time when the Soviet Union was not so vulnerable as looking back in history it might appear to us it was.

At the end of the 21st century, it now must appear obvious to everyone that the Soviet Union was inevitably going to collapse of its own weight. But the Red army was very strong in the 1980's, and the Black Berets were very strong and intimidating in the 1980's.

The truth is that even under those policies of glasnost and perestroika, that Mikhail Gorbachev advanced with such public relations flare throughout the rest of the world, the boot of the Red army was heavy and brutal indeed.

I traveled to Lithuania just after what now is known by history as Bloody Sunday, and the Black Berets murdered so many Lithuanians who were working toward reestablishment of their independence that we will celebrate once again on Sunday.

The truth is that the free people, now the free people of Lithuania—and Freedom House has just rated Lithuania as a free nation objectively, using the standards they used to measure relative freedom throughout the world—the free people of Lithuania did something far more than establish their own independence, their own civil rights, their own civil liberties, their own human rights and personal liberties.

They did something for all of us. They helped tip the balance at that very, very key moment in history against communism, against the Soviet Empire; and Lithuania, more than any other people, is responsible for helping topple the Soviet Empire. Lithuania was part of that empire, unwillingly, of course. It was a captive nation.

Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia have enjoyed a special neighborly bond over a period of many, many years. This Sunday, on Lithuanian Independence Day, there will be hoisted in Vilnius not just the standard of the Lithuanian nation, but also its Baltic neighbors, Latvia and Estonia, to show Baltic solidarity. Lithuania wants very much to hasten its integration, its reintegration, into the community of Europe.

As my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SHIMKUS] has so properly pointed out, that should include Europe's security arrangements, and it should include NATO. He and I and many of our colleagues in this body, Democrats and Republicans, have been urging that this 1999 date be accelerated, that we not prolong a process that should be taking place much more quickly, and that Hungary and Poland and the Czech Republic, for starters, be admitted to NATO on a much more rapid timetable, and that the Baltics very soon afterward be admitted as well.

Thinking back to the key events that led to the reassertion of Lithuania's independence, it is remarkable more than anything else to me to think of who was the unlikely general that led that battle against the Red army.

The most inspiring image for me is that of a piano teacher, a piano teacher at the Conservatory of Music in Vilnius. His name is Doctor, because he is that, of course, by his educational training, Vytautas Landsbergis. Vytautas Landsbergis headed up Sajudis, fighting for human rights, fighting for freedom, fighting for democracy, well before the successful reestablishment of Lithuanian independence.

I had a chance early on, after I got elected to Congress in 1989, to work with him in that fight. I had a chance to be with him on election night when he was elected President of Lithuania.

It was a very, very inspiring thing. But it was not very easy for me to get into Lithuania, because I and the handful of congressional colleagues, that attempted to travel to Lithuania with me as observers of this election, were kept out by the Soviet Union.

This was not some casual bureaucratic dismissal of the travel plans of some Members of Congress, this was a decision taken at the highest level by Edward Shevardnadze, who is the Foreign Minister of the Soviet Union, and by the Supreme Soviet, which voted to keep us out.

We were held in East Berlin for a prolonged period, until finally, around midnight on election night, we were able to get in, and President-elect Landsbergis and all of the Sajudis leaders who were with him met us on the tarmac in the middle of the night, and we embraced. It was very, very emotional. It was a thrill for the reason that I mentioned earlier, not just because there had been a free election in Lithuania, and because the people finally had spoken after so many years of being made slaves by their Communist overlords, but because here was the official commencement of the collapse of the Soviet Empire.

The rest of the world started to awaken to the fact that the Soviet Union was finished on that night. It has not been easy for Lithuania in the wake of that very emotional success. Lithuania has had to work hard to reestablish the rule of law and the fundamentals of free enterprise that make human prosperity possible. They have been doing a good job of it, but they can do a better job, and in future elections I think we will see the forces of democracy and the forces of free enterprise doing even better.

Integration into NATO, in my view, is a way to institutionalize that movement. It is very important for us to keep raising that point, because in 1997, that is one of the significant ways that our foreign policy and the foreign policy of Europe and the foreign policy of the Baltics intersect.

I will just remark to my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois, how proud I am to be here with a member of Lithuanian ancestry, direct Lithuanian ancestry, because it has been my privilege to be made an honorary Lithuanian. I have not done this by birth. But I am so proud of the associations that I have with Lithuanian-Americans and the people in Lithuania that I have met on my multiple trips there. I want to thank the gentleman very much, and offer my good wishes to him as he continues to be a leader on this subject in the Congress.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within



which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of my special order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

#### INTRODUCING LEGISLATION TO RENAME THE SOUTHERN PIEDMONT CONSERVATION RESEARCH CENTER AS THE J. PHIL CAMPBELL SENIOR NATURAL RESOURCE CONSERVATION CENTER

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. MCINNIS]. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. NORWOOD] is recognized for the balance of the time as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. NORWOOD. Today, Mr. Speaker, I again rise to introduce legislation to rename the Southern Piedmont Conservation Research Center in Watkinsville, GA, after a great pioneer in Georgia agriculture, J. Phil Campbell, Sr.

When I introduced this legislation in the 104th Congress, my good friend, the honorable gentleman from Georgia [JOHN LINDER] was the only cosponsor, but today I introduced this legislation with the support of eight of my Georgia colleagues, in hopes of recognizing Mr. Campbell for his many contributions to Georgia farmers.

I want to thank my colleagues, as well as Mr. COVERDELL and Mr. CLELAND in the Senate, for introducing this legislation in that body.

J. Phil Campbell, Sr. lived for only 66 years, but in that time he gave more to men and women of this country than can be measured. His contributions to agriculture, not only in the Southeast but throughout the Nation, are well known and widely recognized. James Philander Campbell was born in Dallas, GA, just northeast of Atlanta, on March 2, 1878.

He grew up on a farm, and at the age of 17, began teaching school. At a young age, J. Phil Campbell, Sr. fought for and helped to secure legislation to authorize agricultural instruction in Georgia's rural schools. In 1907 he spent 6 months traveling throughout our State, advocating for the creation of district agricultural schools and a State college of agriculture.

All of this was done before he turned 30. Between 1908 and 1910, Mr. Campbell served as the first farm extension supervisor to the Southeast region. This was done before the passage of the Smith-Lever Act in 1915, which created the Federal Extension Service.

In 1910, he began a career as the Georgia State agent for the U.S. Department of Agriculture. He also served on the staff of Georgia State University's College of Agriculture.

During his tenure, he organized nearly 13,000 children in corn and canning clubs, and 5,000 Georgia farmers into farming demonstration work. These ef-

forts were done under the supervision of Dr. Seaman Knapp at the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

□ 1600

During this time, Mr. Campbell also served as the director of extension work in agriculture and home economics. In 1933, he took a leave of absence to assist the Agriculture Adjustment Administration in its cotton belt crop replenishment division. After 1935, he was elevated to a Federal position in the Roosevelt Administration as assistant chief of the Soil Conservation Service in USDA. He served in that capacity until he died in December, 1944.

In addition to his clear record of accomplishments in education, Mr. Campbell was also extremely interested in agricultural research and maintained close ties with the agriculture experiment stations in Georgia. He was integral in the creation of the Southern Piedmont Conservation Research Center and in choosing its site just outside of Athens and the University of Georgia.

When funding for the center was threatened in its first year, Phil Campbell fought to keep the center open and secure its line of funding. It exists to this day on Experimental Station Road in Watkinsville, GA.

I again introduce this legislation to recognize Mr. Campbell's contributions to agriculture and to the communities and the Nation he served so ably.

Fortunately, Mr. Campbell's contributions were also recognized during his lifetime. Mr. Campbell was recognized in the Who's Who in America collection in the 1940s. Likewise in the mid 1930s, Dean Paul Chapman, the first dean of the University of Georgia's College of Agriculture said and I quote, "J. Phil Campbell and I were pioneers in promoting professional agricultural work and in the establishing of agencies to carry on such work. With little professional training ourselves, we were plowing new ground to create such training."

Later in a ceremony honoring Mr. Campbell after he had departed Washington, Dean Chapman stated that "no one had as many friends in Georgia as did J. Phil Campbell."

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to again introduce this legislation. In a 1996 letter from the USDA, Secretary of Agriculture Dan Glickman stated that while the USDA generally discourages the naming of its laboratories after any one individual, given the department's admiration and appreciation of "the great service Mr. Campbell has rendered to agriculture and the Nation," the USDA has no objection to the enactment of this legislation.

I also received assurances from CBO that enactment of this bill will result in no significant cost to the Federal Government and does not include any intergovernmental or private sector mandates.

Given this, I again urge my colleagues to join with me this year to

recognize Mr. Campbell's many contributions in supporting passage of this legislation.

I would like to say that my friend J. Campbell, III, we know that he is recuperating in the hospital and we wish him a hasty recovery. And we and all Georgians are very proud of his grandfather.

Mr. Speaker, I include a statement by the gentleman from Georgia [JOHN LINDER] in the RECORD:

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, as a Georgian, I am proud to cosponsor this bill to rename the Southern Piedmont Conservation Research Center in Watkinsville, GA as the J. Phil Campbell, Senior Natural Resource Conservation Center.

For those who may not be familiar with Mr. Campbell and his contributions to Georgia and the Nation, let me give you a brief history of this great man. Born in Dallas, GA in 1878, J. Phil Campbell became a teacher of men at the early age of 17. By age 26, he had worked his way up to assistant superintendent at the first demonstration school in Georgia.

In 1913, Mr. Campbell began working with the Department of Agriculture's Extension Service Demonstration Projects. Demonstrating his zeal for teaching and his enthusiasm for agriculture, J. Phil Campbell, in 1915, became Georgia's first Farm Extension Service Director, a position that he maintained until the 1930's.

He then gave his educational efforts a national focus. After serving as a consultant to President Roosevelt's Department of Agriculture, Mr. Campbell was appointed as the Assistant Chief of the Soil Conservation Service, a position in which he proudly served until his death in 1944.

Not only did J. Phil Campbell act as a catalyst to begin and sustain the farm education effort in Georgia, he focused the Nation's attention in this direction. Among other accomplishments, his efforts resulted in the establishment of the Southern Piedmont Conservation Center in Watkinsville. Though only a small gesture in comparison to Mr. Campbell's life work, renaming the Conservation Center to honor him is an act that I am proud to support.

Though his work ended just over 50 years ago, the impact that J. Phil Campbell had on Georgia and the Nation is everlasting. Let the J. Phil Campbell, Senior Natural Resource Conservation Center be a constant reminder of our gratitude.

#### RULES OF PROCEDURE FOR THE COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL SECURITY, 105TH CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the requirement of clause 2(a) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, I submit herewith the rules of the Committee on National Security for the 105th Congress and ask that they be printed in the RECORD at this point. The committee rules were agreed to by a unanimous voice vote of the committee on February 5, 1997, a quorum being present.

#### RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL SECURITY—104TH CONGRESS

##### RULE 1. APPLICATION OF HOUSE RULES

The Rules of the House of Representatives are the rules of the Committee on National

Security (hereafter referred to in these rules as the "Committee") and its subcommittees so far as applicable.

#### RULE 2. FULL COMMITTEE MEETING DATE

(a) The Committee shall meet every Tuesday at 10:00 a.m., and at such other times as may be fixed by the chairman of the Committee (hereafter referred to in these rules as the "Chairman"), or by written request of members of the Committee pursuant to clause 2(c) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

(b) A Tuesday meeting of the committee may be dispensed with by the Chairman, but such action may be reversed by a written request of a majority of the members of the Committee.

#### RULE 3. SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING DATES

Each subcommittee is authorized to meet, hold hearings, receive evidence, and report to the Committee on all matters referred to it. Insofar as possible, meetings of the Committee and its subcommittees shall not conflict. A subcommittee chairman shall set meeting dates after consultation with the Chairman and the other subcommittee chairmen with a view toward avoiding simultaneous scheduling of committee and subcommittee meetings or hearings wherever possible.

#### RULE 4. SUBCOMMITTEES

The Committee shall be organized to consist of five standing subcommittees with the following jurisdictions:

Subcommittee on Military Installations and Facilities: military construction; real estate acquisitions and disposals; housing and support; base closure; and related legislative oversight.

Subcommittee on Military Personnel: military forces and authorized strengths; integration of active and reserve components; military personnel policy; compensation and other benefits; and related legislative oversight.

Subcommittee on Military Procurement: the annual authorization for procurement of military weapon systems and components thereof, including full scale development and systems transition; military application of nuclear energy; and related legislative oversight.

Subcommittee on Military Readiness: the annual authorization for operation and maintenance; the readiness and preparedness requirements of the defense establishment; and related legislative oversight.

Subcommittee on Military Research and Development: the annual authorization for military research and development and related legislative oversight.

#### RULE 5. COMMITTEE PANELS

(a) The Chairman may designate a panel of the Committee drawn from members of the committee to inquire into and take testimony on a matter or matters that fall within the jurisdiction of more than one subcommittee and to report to the Committee.

(b) No panel so appointed shall continue in existence for more than six months. A panel so appointed may, upon the expiration of six months, be reappointed by the Chairman.

(c) No panel so appointed shall have legislative jurisdiction.

#### RULE 6. REFERENCE OF LEGISLATION AND SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS

(a) The Chairman shall refer legislation and other matters to the appropriate subcommittee or to the full Committee.

(b) Legislation shall be taken up for hearing only when called by the Chairman of the Committee or subcommittee, as appropriate, or by a majority of those present and voting.

(c) The Chairman, with approval of a majority vote of a quorum of the Committee,

shall have authority to discharge a subcommittee from consideration of any measure or matter referred thereto and have such measure or matter considered by the Committee.

(d) Reports and recommendations of a subcommittee may not be considered by the Committee until after the intervention of 3 calendar days from the time the report is approved by the subcommittee and available to the members of the Committee, except that this rule may be waived by a majority vote of a quorum of the Committee.

#### RULE 7. PUBLIC ANNOUNCEMENT OF HEARINGS AND MEETINGS

Pursuant to clause 2(g)(3) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Chairman of the Committee or of any subcommittee or panel shall make public announcement of the date, place, and subject matter of any committee or subcommittee hearing at least one week before the commencement of the hearing. However, if the Chairman of the Committee or of any subcommittee or panel, with the concurrence of the ranking minority member of the Committee or of any subcommittee or panel, determines that there is good cause to begin the hearing sooner, or if the Committee subcommittee or panel so determines by majority vote, a quorum being present for the transaction of business, such chairman shall make the announcement at the earliest possible date. Any announcement made under this rule shall be promptly published in the Daily Digest and promptly entered into the committee scheduling service of the House Information Resources.

#### RULE 8. BROADCASTING OF COMMITTEE HEARINGS AND MEETINGS

Clause 3(f) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives shall apply to the Committee.

#### RULE 9. MEETINGS AND HEARINGS OPEN TO THE PUBLIC

(a) Each hearing and meeting for the transaction of business, including the markup of legislation, conducted by the Committee or a subcommittee shall be open to the public except when the Committee or subcommittee, in open session and with a majority being present, determines by rollcall vote that all or part of the remainder of that hearing or meeting on that day shall be closed to the public because disclosure of testimony, evidence, or other matters to be considered would endanger the national security, would compromise sensitive law enforcement information, or would violate any law or rule of the House of Representatives. Notwithstanding the requirements of the preceding sentence, a majority of those present, there being in attendance no less than two members of the committee or subcommittee, may vote to close a hearing or meeting for the sole purpose of discussing whether testimony or evidence to be received would endanger the national security, would compromise sensitive law enforcement information, or would violate any law or rule of the House of Representatives. If the decision is to close, the vote must be by rollcall vote and in open session, there being a majority of the Committee or subcommittee present.

(b) Whenever it is asserted that the evidence or testimony at a hearing or meeting may tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person, and notwithstanding the requirements of (a) and the provisions of clause 2(g)(2) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, such evidence or testimony shall be presented in closed session, if by a majority vote of those present, there being in attendance no less than two members of the Committee or subcommittee, the Committee or subcommittee determines that

such evidence may tend to defame, degrade or incriminate any person. A majority of those present, there being in attendance no less than two members of the Committee or subcommittee, may also vote to close the hearing or meeting for the sole purpose of discussing whether evidence or testimony to be received would tend to defame, degrade or incriminate any person. The Committee or subcommittee shall proceed to receive such testimony in open session only if the Committee or subcommittee, a majority being present, determines that such evidence or testimony will not tend to defame, degrade or incriminate any person.

(c) Notwithstanding the foregoing, and with the approval of the Chairman, each member of the Committee may designate by letter to the Chairman, a member of that member's personal staff with Top Secret security clearance to attend hearings of the Committee, or that member's subcommittee(s) which have been closed under the provisions of rule 9(a) above for national security purposes for the taking of testimony: Provided, That such staff member's attendance at such hearings is subject to the approval of the Committee or subcommittee as dictated by national security requirements at the time: Provided further, That this paragraph addresses hearings only and not briefings or meetings held under the provisions of paragraph (a) of this rule; and Provided further, That the attainment of any security clearances involved is the responsibility of individual members.

(d) Pursuant to clause 2(g)(2) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, no member may be excluded from nonparticipatory attendance at any hearing of the Committee or a subcommittee, unless the House of Representatives shall by majority vote authorize the Committee or subcommittee, for purposes of a particular series of hearings on a particular article of legislation or on a particular subject of investigation, to close its hearings to members by the same procedures designated in this rule for closing hearings to the public: Provided, however, That the Committee or the subcommittee may by the same procedure vote to close up to 5 additional consecutive days of hearings.

#### RULE 10. QUORUM

(a) For purposes of taking testimony and receiving evidence, two Members shall constitute a quorum.

(b) One-third of the Members of the Committee or subcommittee shall constitute a quorum for taking any action, with the following exceptions, in which case a majority of the Committee or subcommittee shall constitute a quorum:

(1) Reporting a measure or recommendation;

(2) Closing committee or subcommittee meetings and hearings to the public; and

(3) Authorizing the issuance of subpoenas.

(c) No measure or recommendation shall be reported to the House of Representatives unless a majority of the Committee is actually present.

#### RULE 11. THE FIVE-MINUTE RULE

(a) The time any one member may address the Committee or subcommittee on any measure or matter under consideration shall not exceed 5 minutes and then only when the member has been recognized by the Chairman or subcommittee chairman, as appropriate, except that this time limit may be exceeded by unanimous consent. Any member, upon request, shall be recognized for not to exceed 5 minutes to address the Committee or subcommittee on behalf of an amendment which the member has offered to any pending bill or resolution. The 5 minute limitation shall not apply to the Chairman and

ranking minority member of the committee or subcommittee.

(b) Members present at a hearing of the Committee or subcommittee when a hearing is originally convened will be recognized by the Chairman or subcommittee chairman, as appropriate, in order of seniority. Those members arriving subsequently will be recognized in order of their arrival. Notwithstanding the foregoing, the Chairman and the ranking minority member will take precedence upon their arrival. In recognizing members to question witnesses in this fashion, the Chairman shall take into consideration the ratio of the majority to minority members present and shall establish the order of recognition for questioning in such a manner as not to disadvantage the members of the majority.

(c) No person other than Members of Congress and committee staff may be seated in or behind the dais area during committee, subcommittee, or panel hearings or meetings.

#### RULE 12. SUBPOENA AUTHORITY

(a) For the purpose of carrying out any of its functions and duties under rules X and XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Committee and any subcommittee is authorized (subject to subparagraph (b)(1) of this paragraph):

(1) to sit and at such times and places within the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, and to hold hearings, and

(2) to require by subpoena, or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers and documents as it deems necessary. The Chairman of the Committee, or any member designated by the Chairman, may administer oaths to any witness.

(b)(1) A subpoena may be authorized and issued by the Committee, or any subcommittee with the concurrence of the full Committee Chairman, under subparagraph (a)(2) in the conduct of any investigation, or series of investigations or activities, only when authorized by a majority of the members voting, a majority of the Committee or subcommittee being present. Authorized subpoenas shall be signed only by the Chairman, or by any member designated by the Chairman.

(2) Pursuant to clause 2(m) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, compliance with any subpoena issued by the Committee or any subcommittee under subparagraph (a)(2) may be enforced only as authorized or directed by the House.

(c) No witness served with a subpoena by the Committee shall be required against his or her will to be photographed at any hearing or to give evidence or testimony while the broadcasting of that hearing, by radio or television, is being conducted. At the request of any such witness who does not wish to be subjected to radio, television, or still photography coverage, all lenses shall be covered and all microphones used for coverage turned off. This subparagraph is supplementary to clause 2(k)(5) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, relating to the protection of the rights of witnesses.

#### RULE 13. WITNESS STATEMENTS

(a) Any prepared statement to be presented by a witness to the Committee or a subcommittee shall be submitted to the Committee or subcommittee at least 48 hours in advance of presentation and shall be distributed to all members of the Committee or subcommittee at least 24 hours in advance of presentation. A copy of any such prepared statement shall also be submitted to the committee in electronic form contemporaneously with submission of the prepared written statement. If a prepared statement

contains security information bearing a classification of secret or higher, the statement shall be made available in the Committee rooms to all members of the Committee or subcommittee at least 24 hours in advance of presentation; however, no such statement shall be removed from the Committee officers. The requirement of this rule may be waived by a majority vote of a quorum of the Committee or subcommittee, as appropriate.

(b) The Committee and each subcommittee shall require each witness who is to appear before it to file with the Committee in advance of his or her appearance a written statement of the proposed testimony and to limit the oral presentation at such appearance to a brief summary of his or her argument.

#### RULE 14. ADMINISTERING OATHS TO WITNESSES

(a) The Chairman, or any member designated by the Chairman, may administer oaths to any witness.

(b) Witnesses, when sworn, shall subscribe to the following oath:

Do you solemnly swear (or affirm) that the testimony you will give before this Committee (or subcommittee) in the matters now under consideration will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

#### RULE 15. QUESTIONING OF WITNESSES

(a) When a witness is before the Committee or a subcommittee, members of the Committee or subcommittee may put questions to the witness only when they have been recognized by the Chairman or subcommittee chairman, as appropriate, for that purpose.

(b) Members of the Committee or subcommittee who so desire shall have not to exceed 5 minutes to interrogate each witness until such time as each member has had an opportunity to interrogate such witness; thereafter, additional rounds for questioning witnesses by members are discretionary with the Chairman or subcommittee chairman, as appropriate.

(c) Questions put to witnesses before the Committee or subcommittee shall be pertinent to the measure or matter that may be before the Committee or subcommittee for consideration.

#### RULE 16. PUBLICATION OF COMMITTEE HEARINGS AND MARKUPS

The transcripts of those hearings and mark-ups conducted by the Committee or a subcommittee which are decided by the Chairman to be officially published will be published in verbatim form, with the material requested for the record inserted at that place requested, or at the end of the record, as appropriate. Any requests to correct any errors, other than those in transcription, or disputed errors in transcription, will be appended to the record, and the appropriate place where the change is requested will be footnoted.

#### RULE 17. VOTING AND ROLLCALLS

(a) Voting on a measure or matter may be by rollcall vote, division vote, voice vote, or unanimous consent.

(b) A rollcall of the members may be had upon the request of one-fifth of those present.

(c) No vote by any member of the Committee or a subcommittee with respect to any measure or matter may be cast by proxy.

(d) In the event of a vote or votes, when a member is in attendance at any other Committee, subcommittee, or conference committee meeting during that time, the necessary absence of that member shall be so recorded in the rollcall record, upon timely notification to the Chairman by that member.

#### RULE 18. COMMITTEE REPORTS

(a) If, at the time of approval of any measure or matter by the Committee, any mem-

ber of the Committee gives timely notice of intention to file supplemental, minority, additional or dissenting views, that member shall be entitled to not less than 2 calendar days (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays) in which to file such views, in writing and signed by that member, with the staff director of the Committee. All such views so filed by one or more members of the Committee shall be included within, and shall be a part of, the report filed by the Committee with respect to that measure or matter.

(b) With respect to each rollcall vote on a motion to report any measure or matter, and on any amendment offered to the measure or matter, the total number of votes cast for and against, the names of those voting for and against, and a brief description of the question, shall be included in the committee report on the measure or matter.

#### RULE 19. POINTS OF ORDER

No point of order shall lie with respect to any measure reported by the Committee or any subcommittee on the ground that hearings on such measure were not conducted in accordance with the provisions of the rules of the Committee; except that a point of order on that ground may be made by any member of the Committee or subcommittee which reported the measure if, in the Committee or subcommittee, such point of order was (a) timely made and (b) improperly overruled or not properly considered.

#### RULE 20. PUBLIC INSPECTION OF COMMITTEE ROLLCALLS

The result of each rollcall in any meeting of the Committee shall be made available by the Committee for inspection by the public at reasonable times in the offices of the Committee. Information so available for public inspection shall include a description of the amendment, motion, order, or other proposition and the name of each member voting for and each member voting against such amendment, motion, order, or proposition and the names of those members present but not voting.

#### RULE 21. PROTECTION OF NATIONAL SECURITY INFORMATION

(a) Except as provided in clause 2(g) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, all national security information bearing a classification of secret or higher which has been received by the Committee or a subcommittee shall be deemed to have been received in executive session and shall be given appropriate safekeeping.

(b) The Chairman of the Committee shall, with the approval of a majority of the Committee, establish such procedures as in his judgment may be necessary to prevent the unauthorized disclosure of any national security information received classified as secret or higher. Such procedures shall, however, ensure access to this information by any member of the Committee or any other Member of the House of Representatives who has requested the opportunity to review such material.

#### RULE 22. COMMITTEE STAFFING

The staffing of the Committee and the standing subcommittee shall be subject to the rules of the House of Representatives.

#### RULE 23. COMMITTEE RECORDS

The records of the Committee at the National Archives and Records Administration shall be made available for public use in accordance with rule XXXVI of the Rules of the House of Representatives. The Chairman shall notify the ranking minority member of any decision, pursuant to clause 3(b)(3) or clause 4(b) of rule XXXVI, to withhold a record otherwise available, and the matter shall be presented to the Committee for a determination on the written request of any member of the Committee.

## RULE 24. INVESTIGATIVE HEARING PROCEDURES

Clause 2(k) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives shall apply to the Committee.

# RULES OF PROCEDURE FOR THE COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS 105TH CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. TALENT] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. TALENT. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the requirement of clause 2(a) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, I submit herewith the rules of the Committee on Small Business for the 105th Congress and ask that they be printed in the RECORD at this point. These rules were adopted by the committee on February 13, 1997.

## RULES AND PROCEDURES OF THE COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, 105TH CONGRESS

### 1. GENERAL PROVISIONS

The Rules of the House of Representatives, and in particular the committee rules enumerated in rule XI, are the rules of the Committee on Small Business to the extent applicable and by this reference are incorporated. Each subcommittee of the Committee on Small Business (hereinafter referred to as the "committee") is a part of the committee and is subject to the authority and direction of the committee, and to its rules to the extent applicable.

### 2. REFERRAL OF BILLS BY CHAIRMAN

Unless retained for consideration by the full committee, all legislation and other matters referred to the committee shall be referred by the Chairman to the subcommittee of appropriate jurisdiction within 2 weeks. Where the subject matter of the referral involves the jurisdiction of more than one subcommittee or does not fall within any previously assigned jurisdictions, the Chairman shall refer the matter as he may deem advisable.

### 3. DATE OF MEETING

The regular meeting date of the committee shall be the *second Thursday* of every month when the House is in session. A regular meeting of the Committee may be dispensed with if, in the judgment of the Chairman, there is no need for the meeting. Additional meetings may be called by the Chairman as he may deem necessary or at the request of a majority of the members of the committee in accordance with clause 2(c) of rule XI of the House.

At least 3 days' notice of such an additional meeting shall be given unless the Chairman determines that there is good cause to call the meeting on less notice.

The determination of the business to be considered at each meeting shall be made by the Chairman subject to clause 2(c) of rule XI of the House.

A regularly scheduled meeting need not be held if there is no business to be considered or, upon at least 3 days' notice, it may be set for a different date.

### 4. ANNOUNCEMENT OF HEARINGS

Unless the Chairman, with the concurrence of the ranking minority member, or the committee by majority vote, determines that there is good cause to begin a hearing at an earlier date, public announcement shall be made of the date, place and subject matter of any hearing to be conducted by the committee at least 1 week before the commencement of that hearing.

## 5. MEETINGS AND HEARING OPEN TO THE PUBLIC

### (A) MEETINGS

Each meeting of the committee or its subcommittees for the transaction of business, including the markup of legislation, shall be open to the public, including to radio, television and still photography coverage, except as provided by clause 3(f)(2) of rule XI of the House, except when the committee or subcommittee, in open session and with a majority present, determines by rollcall vote that all or part of the remainder of the meeting on that day shall be closed to the public because disclosure of matters to be considered would endanger national security, would compromise sensitive law enforcement information, or would tend to defame, degrade or incriminate any person or otherwise would violate any law or rule of the House: *Provided, however*, That no person other than members of the committee, and such congressional staff and such executive branch representatives as they may authorize, shall be present in any business meeting or markup session which has been closed to the public.

### (B) HEARINGS

Each hearing conducted by the committee or its subcommittees shall be open to the public, including radio, television and still photography coverage, except when the committee or subcommittee, in open session and with a majority present, determines by rollcall vote that all or part of the remainder of the meeting on that day shall be closed to the public because disclosure of testimony, evidence or other matters to be considered would endanger the national security, would compromise sensitive law enforcement information, or would violate any law or rule of the House: *Provided, however*, That the committee or subcommittee may be the same procedure vote to close one subsequent day of hearings. Notwithstanding the requirements of the preceding sentence a majority of those present, there being in attendance the requisite number required under the rules of the committee to be present for the purpose of taking testimony, (i) may vote to close the hearing for the sole purpose of discussing whether testimony or evidence to be received would endanger the national security, would compromise sensitive law enforcement information, or violate clause 2(k)(5) of rule XI of the House; or (ii) may vote to close the hearing, as provided in clause 2(k)(5) of rule XI of the House.

No member of the House may be excluded for nonparticipatory attendance at any hearing of the committee or any subcommittee, unless the House of Representatives shall by majority vote authorize the committee or subcommittee, for purposes of a particular series of hearings on a particular article of legislation or on a particular subject of investigation, to close its hearing to members by the same procedures designated for closing hearings to the public.

## 6. WITNESSES

### (A) STATEMENT OF WITNESSES

Each witness shall file with the committee, 48 hours in advance of his or her appearance, 50 copies of his or her written statement of proposed testimony, and shall limit the oral presentation at such appearance to a brief summary of his or her views.

The committee will provide public access to its printed materials, including the proposed testimony of witnesses, in electronic form.

### (B) INTERROGATION OF WITNESSES

The right to interrogate witnesses before the committee or any of its subcommittees shall alternate between the majority mem-

bers and the minority members. In recognizing members to question witnesses, the Chairman may take into consideration the ratio of majority and minority members present.

## 7. SUBPOENAS

A subpoena may be authorized and issued by the Chairman of the committee in the conduct of any investigation or series of investigations or activities to require the attendance and testimony of such witness and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers and documents as he deems necessary. The ranking minority member shall be promptly notified of the issuance of such a subpoena.

Such a subpoena may be authorized and issued by the chairman of a subcommittee with the approval of a majority of the members of the subcommittee and the approval of the Chairman of the committee.

## 8. QUORUM

No measure or recommendation shall be reported unless a majority of the committee was actually present. For purposes of taking testimony or receiving evidence, two members shall constitute a quorum. For all other purposes, one-third of the members shall constitute a quorum.

## 9. AMENDMENTS DURING MARKUP

Any amendment offered to any pending legislation before the committee must be made available in written form when requested by any member of the committee. If such amendment is not available in written form when requested, the Chairman shall allow an appropriate period for the provision thereof.

## 10. PROXIES

No vote by any member of the committee or any of its subcommittees with respect to any measure or matter may be cast by proxy.

## 11. NUMBER AND JURISDICTION OF SUBCOMMITTEES

There will be four subcommittees as follows:

Empowerment (six Republicans and five Democrats).

Government Programs and Oversight (six Republicans and five Democrats).

Regulatory Reform and Paperwork Reduction (six Republicans and five Democrats).

Tax, Finance and Exports (six Republicans and five Democrats).

During the 105th Congress, the Chairman and ranking minority member shall be *ex officio* members of all subcommittees, without vote, and the full committee shall have the authority to conduct oversight of all areas of the committee's jurisdiction:

In addition to conducting oversight in the area of their respective jurisdiction, each subcommittee shall have the following jurisdiction:

### EMPOWERMENT

Promotion of business growth and opportunities in economically depressed areas.

Oversight and investigative authority over regulations and licensing policies that impact small businesses located in high risk communities.

General oversight of programs targeted toward urban relief.

General promotion of business opportunities.

### GOVERNMENT PROGRAMS AND OVERSIGHT

Small Business Act, Small Business Investment Act, and related legislation.

Federal Government programs that are designed to assist business generally.

Small Business Innovation and Research Program.

Participation of small business in Federal procurement and Government contracts.

Opportunities for minority and women-owned businesses, including the SBA's 8(a) program.

Oversight and investigative authority generally.

#### REGULATORY REFORM AND PAPERWORK REDUCTION

Oversight and investigative authority over the regulatory and paperwork policies of all Federal departments and agencies.

Regulatory Flexibility Act.

Paperwork Reduction Act.

Competition policy generally.

#### TAX, FINANCE AND EXPORTS

Tax policy and its impact on small business.

Access to capital and finance issues generally.

Export opportunities and promotion.

#### 12. COMMITTEE STAFF

##### (A) MAJORITY STAFF

The employees of the committee, except those assigned to the minority as provided below, shall be appointed and assigned, and may be removed by the Chairman. Their remuneration shall be fixed by the Chairman, and they shall be under the general supervision and direction of the Chairman.

##### (B) MINORITY STAFF

The employees of the committee assigned to the minority shall be appointed and assigned, and their remuneration determined, as the ranking minority member of the committee shall determine.

##### (C) SUBCOMMITTEE STAFF

The Chairman and ranking minority member of the full committee shall endeavor to ensure that sufficient staff is made available to each subcommittee to carry out its responsibilities under the rules of the committee.

#### 13. POWERS AND DUTIES OF SUBCOMMITTEES

Each subcommittee is authorized to meet, hold hearings, receive evidence, and report to the full committee on all matters referred to it. Subcommittee chairmen shall set meeting and hearing dates after consultation with the Chairman of the full committee. Meetings and hearings of subcommittees shall not be scheduled to occur simultaneously with meetings or hearings of the full committee.

#### 14. SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS

##### (A) INVESTIGATIVE HEARINGS

The report of any subcommittee on a matter which was the topic of a study or investigation shall include a statement concerning the subject of the study or investigation, the findings and conclusions, and recommendations for corrective action, if any, together with such other material as the subcommittee deems appropriate.

Such proposed reports shall first be approved by a majority of the subcommittee members. After such approval has been secured, the proposed report shall be sent to each member of the full committee for his or her supplemental, minority, or additional views.

Any such views shall be in writing and signed by the member and filed with the clerk of the full committee within 5 calendar days (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays) from the date of the transmittal of the proposed report to the members. Transmittal of the proposed report to members shall be by hand delivery to the members' offices.

After the expiration of such 5 calendar days, the report may be filed as a House report.

##### (B) END OF CONGRESS

Each subcommittee shall submit to the full committee, not later than November 15

of each even-numbered year, a report on the activities of the subcommittee during the Congress.

#### 15. RECORDS

The committee shall keep a complete record of all actions which shall include a record of the votes of any question on which a rollcall vote is demanded. The result of each subcommittee rollcall vote, together with a description of the matter voted upon, shall promptly be made available to the full committee. A record of such votes shall be made available for inspection by the public at reasonable times in the offices of the committee.

The committee shall keep a complete record of all committee and subcommittee activity which, in the case of any meeting or hearing transcript, shall include a substantially verbatim account of remarks actually made during the proceedings, subject only to technical, grammatical, and typographical corrections authorized by the person making the remarks involved.

The records of the committee at the National Archives and Records Administration shall be made available in accordance with rule XXXVI of the Rules of the House. The Chairman of the full committee shall notify the ranking minority member of the full committee of any decision, pursuant to clause 3(b)(3) or clause 4(b) of rule XXXVI of the House, to withhold a record otherwise available, and the matter shall be presented to the committee for a determination of the written request of any member of the committee.

#### 16. ACCESS TO CLASSIFIED OR SENSITIVE INFORMATION

Access to classified or sensitive information supplied to the committee and attendance at closed sessions of the committee or its subcommittees shall be limited to members and necessary committee staff and stenographic reporters who have appropriate security clearance when the Chairman determines that such access or attendance is essential to the functioning of the committee.

The procedures to be followed in granting access to those hearings, records, data, charts, and files of the committee which involve classified information or information deemed to be sensitive shall be as follows:

(a) Only Members of the House of Representatives and specifically designated committee staff of the Committee on Small Business may have access to such information.

(b) Members who desire to read materials that are in the possession of the committee should notify the clerk of the committee or the subcommittee possessing the materials.

(c) The clerk will maintain an accurate access log which identifies the circumstances surrounding access to the information, without revealing the material examined.

(d) If the material desired to be reviewed is material which the committee or subcommittee deems to be sensitive enough to require special handling, before receiving access to such information, individuals will be required to sign an access information sheet acknowledging such access and that the individual has read and understands the procedures under which access is being granted.

(e) Material provided for review under this rule shall not be removed from a specified room within the committee offices.

(f) Individuals reviewing materials under this rule shall make certain that the materials are returned to the proper custodian.

(g) No reproductions or recordings may be made of any portion of such materials.

(h) The contents of such information shall not be divulged to any person in any way, form, shape or manner, and shall not be discussed with any person who has not received the information in an authorized manner.

(i) When not being examined in the manner described herein, such information will be kept in secure safes or locked file cabinets in the committee offices.

(j) These procedures only address access to information the committee or a subcommittee deems to be sensitive enough to require special treatment.

(k) If a Member of the House of Representatives believes that certain sensitive information should not be restricted as to dissemination or use, the Member may petition the committee or subcommittee to so rule. With respect to information and materials provided to the committee by the executive branch, the classification of information and materials as determined by the executive branch shall prevail unless affirmatively changed by the committee or the subcommittee involved, after consultation with the appropriate executive agencies.

(l) Other materials in the possession of the committee are to be handled in accordance with the normal practices and traditions of the committee.

#### 17. OTHER PROCEDURES

The Chairman of the full committee may establish such other procedures and take such actions as may be necessary to carry out the foregoing rules or to facilitate the effective operation of the committee.

The committee may not be committed to any expense whatever without the prior approval of the Chairman of the full committee.

#### 18. AMENDMENTS TO COMMITTEE RULES

The rules of the committee may be modified, amended or repealed by a majority of the members, at a meeting specifically called for such purpose, but only if written notice of the proposed change has been provided to each such member at least 3 days before the time of the meeting.

### RULES OF PROCEDURE FOR THE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM AND OVERSIGHT 105TH CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the requirement of clause 2(a) or rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, I submit herewith the rules of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight for the 105th Congress and ask that they be printed in the RECORD at this point. These rules were adopted by the committee on February 12, 1997.

#### I. RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM AND OVERSIGHT

##### RULE 1. APPLICATION OF RULES

Except where the terms "full committee" and "subcommittee" are specifically referred to, the following rules shall apply to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight and its subcommittees as well as to the respective chairmen. [See House Rule XI, 1.]

##### RULE 2. MEETINGS

The regular meetings of the full Committee shall be held on the second Tuesday of each month at 10:00 a.m., when the House is in session. The chairman is authorized to dispense with a regular meeting or to change the date thereof, and to call and convene additional meetings, when circumstances warrant. A special meeting of the committee may be requested by members of the committee following the provisions of House Rule XI, 2(c)2. Subcommittees shall meet at

the call of the subcommittee chairmen. Every member of the committee or the appropriate subcommittee, unless prevented by unusual circumstances, shall be provided with a memorandum at least three calendar days before each meeting or hearing explaining (1) the purpose of the meeting or hearing; and (2) the names, titles, background and reasons for appearance of any witnesses. The ranking minority member shall be responsible for providing the same information on witnesses whom the minority may request. [See House Rule XI, 2(b).]

#### RULE 3. QUORUMS

A majority of the members of the committee shall form a quorum, except that two members shall constitute a quorum for taking testimony and receiving evidence, and one-third of the members shall form a quorum for taking any action other than the reporting of a measure or recommendation. If the chairman is not present at any meeting of the committee or subcommittee, the ranking member of the majority party on the committee or subcommittee who is present shall preside at that meeting. [See House Rule XI, 2(h).]

#### RULE 4. COMMITTEE REPORTS

Bills and resolutions approved by the committee shall be reported by the chairman following House Rule XI, 2(l).

Every investigative report shall be approved by a majority vote of the committee at a meeting at which a quorum is present. Supplemental, minority, or additional views may be filed following House Rule XI, 2(l)(5). The time allowed for filing such views shall be three calendar days, beginning on the day of notice but excluding Saturday, Sundays, and legal holidays (unless the House is in session on such a day), unless the committee agrees to a different time, but agreement on a shorter time shall require the concurrence of each member seeking to file such views. A proposed report shall not be considered in subcommittee or full committee unless the proposed report has been available to the members of such subcommittee or full committee for at least three calendar days (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays) before consideration of such proposed report in subcommittee or full committee. An investigative report or oversight report will be considered as read if available, to the members, at least 24 hours before consideration, excluding Saturdays, Sundays and legal holidays unless the House is in session on such days. If hearings have been held on the matter reported upon, every reasonable effort shall be made to have such hearings available to the members of the subcommittee or full committee before the consideration of the proposed report in such subcommittee or full committee. An investigative or oversight report may be filed after sine die adjournment of the last regular session of the Congress, provided that if a member gives timely notice of intention to file supplemental, minority or additional views, that member shall be entitled to not less than seven calendar days in which to submit such views for inclusion with the report.

Only those reports approved by a majority vote of the committee may be ordered printed, unless otherwise required by the Rules of the House of Representatives.

#### RULE 5. PROXY VOTES

In accordance with the Rules of the House of Representatives, members may not vote by proxy on any measure or matter before the committee or any subcommittee. [See House Rule XI, 2(f).]

#### RULE 6. ROLL CALLS

A roll call of the members may be had upon the request of any member upon approval of a one-fifth vote. [See House Rule XI, 2(e).]

#### RULE 7. RECORD OF COMMITTEE ACTIONS

The committee staff shall maintain in the committee offices a complete record of committee actions from the current Congress including a record of the rollcall votes taken at committee business meetings. The original records, or true copies thereof, as appropriate, shall be available for public inspection whenever the committee offices are open for public business. The staff shall assure that such original records are preserved with no unauthorized alteration, additions, or defacement. [See House Rule XI, 2(e).]

#### RULE 8. SUBCOMMITTEES; REFERRALS

There shall be seven subcommittees with appropriate party ratios that shall have fixed jurisdictions. Bills, resolutions, and other matters shall be referred by the chairman to subcommittees within two weeks for consideration or investigation in accordance with their fixed jurisdictions. Where the subject matter of the referral involves the jurisdiction of more than one subcommittee or does not fall within any previously assigned jurisdiction, the chairman shall refer the matter as he may deem advisable. Bills, resolutions, and other matters referred to subcommittees may be reassigned by the chairman when, in his judgement, the subcommittee is not able to complete its work or cannot reach agreement therein. In a subcommittee having an even number of members, if there is a tie vote with all members voting on any measure, the measure shall be placed on the agenda for full committee consideration as if it had been ordered reported by the subcommittee without recommendation. This provision shall not preclude further action on the measure by the subcommittee. [See House Rule XI, 1(a)(2).]

#### RULE 9. EX OFFICIO MEMBERS

The chairman and the ranking minority member of the committee shall be ex officio members of all subcommittees. They are authorized to vote on subcommittee matters; but, unless they are regular members of the subcommittee, they shall not be counted in determining a subcommittee quorum other than a quorum for taking testimony.

#### RULE 10. STAFF

Except as otherwise provided by House Rule XI, 5 and 6, the chairman of the full committee shall have the authority to hire and discharge employees of the professional and clerical staff of the full committee and of subcommittees.

#### RULE 11. STAFF DIRECTION

Except as otherwise provided by House Rule XI, 5 and 6, the staff of the committee shall be subject to the direction of the chairman of the full committee and shall perform such duties as he may assign.

#### RULE 12. HEARING DATES AND WITNESSES

The chairman of the full committee will announce the date, place, and subject matter of all hearings at least one week before the commencement of any hearings, unless he determines, with the concurrence of the ranking minority member, or the committee determines by a vote, that there is good cause to begin such hearings sooner. So that the chairman of the full committee may coordinate the committee facilities and hearings plans, each subcommittee chairman shall notify him of any hearing plans at least two weeks before the date of commencement of hearings, including the date, place, subject matter, and the names of witnesses, willing and unwilling, who would be called to testify, including, to the extent he is advised thereof, witnesses whom the minority members may request. The minority members shall supply the names of witnesses they intend to call to the chairman of the full committee or subcommittee at the earliest possible

date. Witnesses appearing before the committee shall so far as practicable, submit written statements at least 24 hours before their appearance and, when appearing in a non-governmental capacity, provide a curriculum vitae and a listing of any Federal Government grants and contracts received in the previous fiscal year. [See House Rules XI, 2(g)(3), (g)(4), (j), and (k).]

#### RULE 13. OPEN MEETINGS

Meetings for the transaction of business and hearings of the committee shall be open to the public or closed in accordance with Rule XI of the House of Representatives. [See House Rules XI, 2 (g) and (k).]

#### RULE 14: FIVE-MINUTE RULE

(1) A committee member may question a witness only when recognized by the chairman for that purpose. In accordance with House Rule XI, 2(j)(2), each committee member may request up to five minutes to question a witness until each member who so desires has had such opportunity. Until all such requests have been satisfied, the chairman shall, so far as practicable, recognize alternately based on seniority of those majority and minority members present at the time the hearing was called to order and others based on their arrival at the hearing. After that, additional time may be extended at the direction of the chairman.

(2) The chairman, with the concurrence of the ranking minority member, or the committee by motion, may permit an equal number of majority and minority members to question a witness for a specified, total period that is equal for each side and not longer than thirty minutes for each side.

(3) The chairman, with the concurrence of the ranking minority member, or the committee by motion, may permit committee staff of the majority and minority to question a witness for a specified, total period that is equal for each side and not longer than thirty minutes for each side.

(4) Nothing in paragraph (2) or (3) affects the rights of a Member (other than a Member designated under paragraph (2)) to question a witness for 5 minutes in accordance with paragraph (1) after the questioning permitted under paragraph (2) or (3). In any extended questioning permitted under paragraph (2) or (3), the Chairman shall determine how to allocate the time permitted for extended questioning by majority members or majority committee staff and the ranking minority member shall determine how to allocate the time permitted for extended questioning by minority members or minority committee staff. The Chairman or the ranking minority member, as applicable, may allocate the time for any extended questioning permitted to staff under paragraph (3) to members.

#### RULE 15. INVESTIGATIVE HEARINGS; PROCEDURE

Investigative hearings shall be conducted according to the procedures in House Rule XI, 2(k). All questions put to witnesses before the committee shall be relevant to the subject matter before the committee for consideration, and the chairman shall rule on the relevance of any questions put to the witnesses.

#### RULE 16. STENOGRAPHIC RECORD

A stenographic record of all testimony shall be kept of public hearings and shall be made available on such conditions as the chairman may prescribe.

#### RULE 17. TV, RADIO, AND PHOTOGRAPHS

An open meeting or hearing of the committee or a subcommittee may be covered, in whole or in part, by television broadcast, radio broadcast, and still photography, or by any such methods of coverage, unless closed subject to the provisions of House Rule XI, 3.

## RULE 18: ADDITIONAL DUTIES OF CHAIRMAN

The chairman of the full committee shall:

(a) Make available to other committees the findings and recommendations resulting from the investigations of the committee or its subcommittees as required by House Rule X, 4(c)(2);

(b) Direct such review and studies on the impact or probable impact of tax policies affecting subjects within the committee's jurisdiction as required by House Rule X, 2(c);

(c) Submit to the Committee on the Budget views and estimates required by House Rule X, 4(g), and to file reports with the House as required by the Congressional Budget Act;

(d) Authorize and issue subpoenas as provided in House Rule XI, clause 2(m), in the conduct of any investigation or activity or series of investigations or activities within the jurisdiction of the committee;

(e) Prepare, after consultation with subcommittee chairmen and the minority, a budget for the committee which shall include an adequate budget for the subcommittees to discharge their responsibilities;

(f) Make any necessary technical and conforming changes to legislation reported by the committee upon unanimous consent; and

(g) Will designate a Vice Chairman from the majority party.

## RULE 19: COMMEMORATIVE STAMPS

The committee has adopted the policy that the determination of the subject matter of commemorative stamps properly is for consideration by the Postmaster General and that the committee will not give consideration to legislative proposals for the issuance of commemorative stamps. It is suggested that recommendations for the issuance of commemorative stamps be submitted to the Postmaster General.

## AFRICAN-AMERICAN HISTORY MONTH AND RACE ENTERTAINMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCINNIS). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. JACKSON] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am particularly honored on this occasion to welcome the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SHIMKUS] to the 105th Congress. I know he gave his first special order just a few moments ago. He, like I, when I first became a Member of this institution, was quite nervous, and we talked about it just before he began. But I wanted to take this opportunity to welcome him to the 105th Congress and indicate to him how much I look forward to serving with him in this institution.

Today for the better part of this special order I want to talk about a subject that is near and dear to my heart, that is near and dear to 39 Members of this institution, the Congressional Black Caucus. This is African-American History Month. We find ourselves this February confronting some challenges as a nation.

We have heard our Speaker talk about racial reconciliation. We have heard our President address the issue of racial reconciliation. And I thought what a better start we could have if we could just begin an honest dialogue

about racial reconciliation in the context of Black History Month.

Carter G. Woodson is known as the father of black history. Originally it was designated to be just one week long, and then it eventually became a month. He knew that the African-American experience was unique and that the chronologizing of the African-American history and the chronologizing of American history did not, would not and could not acknowledge the contributions that African-Americans have made.

Recently racial reconciliation has become a widely talked about issue. The O.J. case has forced us to face the wide gap separating white and black Americans in their views of our criminal justice system. How can people have such different perspectives of the same case according to the color of their skin? It becomes obvious that blacks and whites are not speaking from the same page because both groups are looking at the case through the lens of their own experiences, in this case, the experiences of whites versus the experiences of people of color with the criminal justice system.

The first step in a process of racial reconciliation is to build understanding between the races. We cannot have an effective conversation about racial reconciliation, which is one of the Speaker's goals, which is certainly one of the President's goals, if we do not try to understand the other group and their experiences. This is what Carter G. Woodson was thinking about and reflecting about when he wanted us as a Nation to pause during the month of February to acknowledge the contribution of African-Americans.

The purpose of this special order today is to take that first step, a serious dialogue about race issues, by beginning to explain the historical experience of African-Americans and by explaining the history of obstacles and advances which have allowed me to stand in this room and speak to you today as the 91st African-American Member of Congress.

To talk about the history of blacks in America, one cannot avoid the story of the struggle against discrimination in America. The two are intertwined. It is hard for many people to sit down and listen to a history full of discrimination. Many people do not want to relive it. Others do not feel like, they feel more like they are being blamed, but the history has to be told because many people are not aware of the full history, Mr. Speaker.

To build bridges, we have to build awareness. One of the greatest problems in race relations is the lack of awareness about discrimination. The discrimination that many blacks experience every day as common knowledge is the same discrimination that many whites do not experience and do not realize even exists. As a Member of this institution, I found myself in the 104th Congress, since I do not wear the identification pin that most Members of

Congress tend to wear, late at night standing out in front of the Capitol of the United States trying to catch a taxi.

Why can I not catch a taxi late at night in Washington, DC? I do not know. But I have some assumptions. That young African-American males in America trying to catch a cab late at night, where the cab driver is white or black, brings certain prejudices to the whole notion of catching a cab. For example, they may think that I am going to rob them. They may think that I am going to take something from them when the reality is nothing could be further from the truth. Discrimination exists even for Members of this institution as Members of Congress whether we talk about it in our daily lives on the floor of this Congress or not.

The purpose of this speech today is not to blame or create guilt over black history. It is to build an understanding, to begin to explain the experiences of African-Americans. A better understanding, I genuinely believe, will help us move past the guilt to create positive change.

So I must ask each and every one, particularly the Members who are in their offices today to do just one thing: Put aside your opinions for now and try to imagine with me for a moment what it is like to be an African-American. I ask those of you who are not African-Americans to imagine that you are experiencing the history as being an African-American, that is the history of your people in this country, the history of your sisters, your brothers, your parents and your grandparents. I ask you to imagine what it would feel like had you had to have that certain outlook on the world.

I ask if you are an African-American to listen to this story as if you were white, as if this was the first time you heard some of these accounts. How would you react?

My first special order, one of five special orders I plan to have this month, is entitled, "O.J. and Race Entertainment." The noted historian John Hope Franklin in his book, "The Color Line," 1993, said perhaps the very first thing we need to do as a nation and as individual members of society is to confront our past and to see it for what it is. If we do that, he says, whites will discover that African-Americans possess the same human qualities that other Americans possess, and African-Americans will discover that white Americans are capable of the most sublime expressions of human conduct of which all human beings are capable.

Then he suggests we need to do everything possible to emphasize the positive qualities that all of us have, qualities that we have never had to utilize to the fullest but which remain, but which we must utilize if we are to solve the problem of the color line in the 21st century.

America is a nation that is in dire need of entertainment. And the media, Mr. Speaker, knows how to provide it.



You want movie entertainment, go see Independence Day. You go see a movie that does what no Democrats or Republicans could ever do, watch the aliens blow up Capitol Hill, not the deficit or the debt, but aliens. Watch them blow up the White House, watch them destroy Wall Street. If you want good movie entertainment, go see Independence Day.

If you want sports entertainment, you have the best, Michael Jordan, and, some could arguably say, the worst, Dennis Rodman on the same team. Why is that? Because Dennis Rodman—multicolored hair, many tatoos, more earrings on his body than a fishing lure—he understands entertainment. You want race entertainment and you do not want to have a serious dialog about race, about injustice in America. Here is O.J.

In fact, race entertainment is becoming increasingly popular. Name another subject that could give Geraldo Rivera the same television viewer ratings or Rush Limbaugh the same radio listenership. O.J. Simpson has given virtual rise to a new entertainment network, race entertainment television.

It is not substantive discussion about understandings from African-Americans, Asian-Americans, native Americans, women in our society or people who are working upward in the society to make a difference for their families. No, that is not O.J. entertainment or race entertainment. You want race entertainment, nonsensical dialog about moving the society forward, engage in it.

Talking about race and racial reconciliation is clearly becoming the in thing. It is the politically acceptable thing. The Nation responded positively to President Clinton's discussion of racial diversity in his inaugural address on Martin Luther King, Jr.'s holiday and again in his State of the Union Address. Speaker GINGRICH followed with a call on race ignorance and drugs.

Nobody in the media wants to just talk about the O.J. Simpson verdict. They wanted to talk about the O.J. Simpson verdict and what it is revealing about the current state of race relations in America. The fact that the O.J. Simpson trial is being viewed and used as a news hook to talk about race in this country is a sign of just how far off the point the media truly is. If we are going to have an honest conversation about this, we have to ask ourselves the question, why do African-Americans and white Americans see the justice system so differently?

□ 1615

Let us look at some of the historical chronology, and then we will come back to O.J.

In 1705, a Massachusetts law provided that any African-American or mulatto who struck a white person be severely whipped, at the discretion of the justices before whom the offender was convicted.

In 1708, a Connecticut law imposed a penalty riot exceeding lashes for any African-American who disturbed the peace or attempted to strike a white person.

In 1718, a Rhode Island law was enacted that said to the States if a slave is found in a free black's home, both should be whipped.

In 1730, a Connecticut law provided for penalty of 40 lashes for any black, native American, or mulatto who attempted to defame a white person.

Of particular importance to O.J., and I have not heard this in any of the analysis, in 1816 a Louisiana State law prohibited slaves from testifying against whites and free blacks except in cases where free blacks were allegedly involved in slave uprisings.

In 1827, from my State, the State of Illinois, a law decreed that blacks and native Americans and mulattos were incompetent to testify in court against whites.

In 1831, here is a real case study, Ohio said that African-Americans were prohibited from serving on juries as a matter of law.

In 1848, Ohio's black laws were then reversed, giving blacks legal standing in the courts.

In 1849, Ohio lifted its ban on testimony by blacks in courts.

In 1855, black Bostonians protested the absence of black jurors and called for equal judicial rights.

In 1860, two blacks in Worcester, MA, were named jurors, the first black jurors in Massachusetts's history.

In 1862, California African-Americans were granted the right to testify in cases for the first time where white men were defendants.

In 1865, the first interracial jury in the United States indicted Jefferson Davis for treason. The case was set for trial in 1868.

In 1880, in *Stauder versus West Virginia*, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that the exclusion of blacks from the jury was unconstitutional. And the way around the *Stauder* case, many prosecutors have now used preemptory strikes to accomplish what the Constitution has already eliminated as unconstitutional.

In 1919, in *State versus Young*, the West Virginia Supreme Court ruled that a black man sentenced to life in prison was denied equal protection under the law because his jury had no black members. The State subsequently admitted black jury members.

In 1926, Violette N. Anderson was the first black woman attorney to present a case before the U.S. Supreme Court.

In 1930, President Hoover nominated Judge John J. Parker of North Carolina, a known Klansman, to the U.S. Supreme Court. The NAACP led a successful campaign against Mr. Parker's confirmation.

In 1947, be patient with me, I am coming up to 1997, Rosa Lee Ingram, a Georgia tenant farmer, and two of her husbands were convicted and sentenced to death for the murder of a white man

whom Ingram alleged assaulted her. The case spurred a national defense and an amnesty program that resulted in her pardon in 1959.

On the mind of every African-American still living today, 1955, Emmett Till, a 14-year-old black youth, was murdered in Mississippi by white men. The murder was so brutal and the child's body was beaten so badly that at first he could only be identified by the ring that he was wearing.

The reason for his murder: A Chicago native, on a dare from his friends, on a dare from his friends, whistled at a white woman. The two white men arrested for the crime were acquitted by an all-white jury.

The particularly graphic picture of Emmett Till's body appeared in *Jet* magazine and is freshly etched in the minds of every African-American.

In 1959, Mack Charles Parker was lynched in Poplarville, MS. A grand jury received evidence in the case but refused to acknowledge that a lynching had even occurred.

In 1961, on an integrated bus in Alabama, there were routinely arrests in Mississippi, and, as they routinely arrested people in Mississippi, a Federal judge had to issue an injunction against the police to get them to protect the Freedom Riders.

Later, evidence surfaces that local police in Birmingham and Montgomery were involved in the violence and that an FBI employee participated in the Ku Klux Klan's strategy sessions. The FBI did nothing to stop the violence it knew was planned.

These are accounts that my grandmother, who is still living, and my great-grandmother, God rest her soul, she is still living and in a coma, often used to tell us about. She used to tell us in 1963 about Medgar Evers, the civil rights activist and field secretary for the NAACP. He was shot in the back.

The rifle bore the fingerprints of Byron de la Beckwith, a vocal member of a local white supremacist group. Despite overwhelming evidence against Mr. Beckwith, including an earlier statement that he wanted to kill Mr. Evers, Beckwith was set free after two trials with all-white juries.

In 1989, evidence surfaced suggesting that juries had been tampered with. Beckwith was not convicted for the murder until over 26 years after he had committed the crime.

Just 2 years ago this case was resolved, and there is presently a movie at the theater starring Whoopi Goldberg to illustrate how recent and current the history is that many African-Americans have with juries.

The FBI files referred to Dr. King as the most dangerous Negro leader in the Nation from the standpoint of communism, the Negro, and the national security. The FBI began high surveillance of this civil rights leader and those close to him in an attempt to expose, disrupt, discredit, and otherwise neutralize them. Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy authorized the FBI to tap Dr. King's phones.

An FBI letter referring to Dr. King and other civil rights leaders that it would "be unrealistic to limit ourselves, as we have been doing, to legalistic proofs or definitely conclusive evidence that would stand up in the court or before congressional committees."

In an attempt to replace King with a manageable black leader, the FBI, under the direction of J. Edgar Hoover, began an extended character assault against Dr. King, labeling him a Communist sympathizer and an adulterer.

The O.J. Simpson verdicts themselves are really, Mr. Speaker, not that complicated. Assuming the rules of the judicial system in Los Angeles and Santa Monica were fair and followed, and only the appellate process will determine that, we must accept both verdicts if we are to live in a nation of laws and not men and women. Personal views are just that, personal views, to which everyone is entitled. They are irrelevant, however, with respect to being in a nation of laws.

The principle should not be difficult to accept. All of us want to live and work in a nation of laws, in a society where equal protection of the laws is respected and accepted. This really, Mr. Speaker, should be all there is to O.J. Simpson. Guilty, not guilty, and guilty. That is over with and done with.

But how do we get from O.J. Simpson's verdicts to race relations and to race entertainment? I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, we arrive at this conclusion by dealing with symbols over substance and talk over action.

President Clinton stood on the steps of the Capitol, looking west toward the Lincoln Memorial, the spot where Dr. King gave his famous 1963 speech. When he gave his Inaugural speech and paid tribute to Dr. King's dream, President Clinton spoke to the poetic symbolism of Dr. King's dream but not to its economic substance.

Dr. King stood on the steps of the Lincoln Memorial, looking east toward the Capitol and the Congress, and he spoke to them about our Nation's budget priorities, about economic justice as the path to racial justice as the substance of his speech. He talked about a promissory note, about a check that had bounced, that had been returned, that had been marked "Insufficient funds."

But Dr. King refused to believe that the bank of justice was bankrupt, and he said that there would neither be rest nor tranquility in America until the promissory note was made good.

Today, the White House and both Democrats and Republicans discussed that same promissory note, that same bounced check, and that same bank of justice, using different terms. Now the false bankruptcy is called a balanced budget or balanced budget amendment.

Assessing the state of the Union depends on one's vantage point. You see one thing if you are on the top looking down. It was a great speech for those of

us who were on the top looking down. You see quite another thing if you are a worker or you are poor or you are economically insecure and you are looking up.

If you are well educated, if you are employed full time at basically a job of your choosing, if you are making a decent salary, if you and your family have good health and an insurance plan, if you are living in a relatively safe and affordable house, then the state of the Union is pretty much what President Clinton said it was in his State of the Union Address. Then we, as a nation, have a decent shot clearly, at that level, at making racial progress.

But you may be 1 of the 15 to 20 million Americans who are unemployed, underemployed, working part time when you want to be working full time, have never had a job, gave up looking for a job so that you are not even counted among the unemployed, or with corporate or government downsizing you are worried that you may be soon in one of these categories.

In that economic climate, does anyone think that the American people can really hear and really understand a conversation about race and racial reconciliation?

If you are 1 of the 40 million Americans without health insurance, another 40 million with inadequate health insurance, a worker who is being asked to pay more for less medical care, is anyone who is ill-insured or has no insurance, is anyone really convinced that racial reconciliation is high atop that individual's priorities and agenda?

If you are not living in safe, sanitary, and affordable housing, then you have a personal housing crisis. But much of the country lives that way, so America has a housing crisis.

In the late sixties, a White House Conference on Housing called for 26 million housing starts over the next 10 years, with 6 million federally subsidized. That translates into 2,600,000 each year, 600,000 federally subsidized housing over 10 years.

The Nation has never approximated that goal, and currently we are over 1.5 million new housing starts. And the population has grown, so the crisis is worse today than it was three decades ago. Thus, we now need more housing than ever, for America is ill-housed. How can we expect people to be sensitive about race and about racial reconciliation when there is a housing crisis?

Our education system is in crisis. Not all of our children are being educated for work and life in the 21st century. Certainly, one can say that the President made a huge effort in his State of the Union Address to improve our educational system and make it more accessible to more people through the various initiatives he spelled out in his speech in the form of tax breaks, tuition grants, and scholarships. For that, he is to be commended.

While the effort was there, and I agreed with that, for quality of edu-

cation is an entitlement of every American, one cannot be as sure about the effectiveness of these programs for the students who have the greatest need, those who are the least well off. While many will benefit from the President's plan, it appears that most of the money will go to students who plan to attend college anyway.

It is a kind of "Democrats for the leisure class" approach of giving tax relief to the middle class in the guise of education reform; a tinkering, top-down, talented, and technocratic approach to solving a very real problem.

In my district, I have cities that do not have tax bases at all, not one job in the town, not enough money, Mr. Speaker, to raise revenue to pay their firemen, to pay their police officers. In this particular context, high school students are in school districts where there are no resources on a regular basis, a consistent basis, to pay teachers what they deserve. Can we really move systematically toward solving our race problem when we cannot provide a quality education for all of America's children?

On the watch of a current Democrat President and a Republican Congress, the United States has become the most economically unequal industrialized democracy in the world in terms of wealth and income. While taxes have probably never been totally fair for the average American, tax unfairness was dramatically escalated under the Reagan tax program of 1981. Thus, we do not need a more benevolent and less extreme tax plan than Ronald Reagan's, we need a reversal of that plan.

We do not need tax cuts for the middle class as much as we need fair taxes for everybody. Inherent in fair taxes for all is a reduction in taxes for the middle class, the working class, and the poor. How does one get racial justice in America in the context of economic injustice?

□ 1630

The reality is you cannot. The more likely outcome and one which we are currently witnessing is the dynamic scapegoating of people of color and the poor in a mean spirit. The logical result of this current economic climate is the passage of proposition 187, immigrant bashing in California and other xenophobic measures.

The current racial climate engenders scapegoating by blaming the lack of jobs on affirmative action for women and people of color. In this current climate it is the politically weakest and most vulnerable among us who are being economically assaulted in the name of welfare reform.

The reality is, Mr. Speaker, there can only be anecdotal racial reconciliation under the present circumstances of economic inequality and insecurity. Thus, to talk about race and racial reconciliation without acting to bring about a full employment peacetime economy, without universal and comprehensive health care system, without

adequate, safe and affordable housing for every American, without quality education for every American child, without economic fairness in wealth and income, is talk that can only lead to more hostility, frustration and racial animosity. To deal with the American people on the matter of race in such a manner is to play games with them. It is engaging in race entertainment.

Frustration at the inability to make racial progress will lead to increased racial tensions, witnessed daily on television or experienced every day by average black, white, red, yellow, brown people. Or in the extreme, it can even lead to a racial explosion, as we witnessed in the aftermath of the Rodney King trial.

The other alternative, Mr. Speaker, is to think that you are contributing to racial progress merely by talking about it privately. I am reminded about former Senator Bill Bradley's poignant statement, "When is the last time you sat down with a person of another race and had a frank discussion about race?"

Yes, dialog undoubtedly helps break down barriers and contributes to understanding, but enhanced personal interactions, without economic progress, will never achieve the goal of racial reconciliation. One might wonder why I appear to be downplaying the importance of educating the American people about race through public dialog.

My point is that merely talking about or reporting on race relations through the media, especially television, is subject to the same limitations as in the case of individual dialog. Ted Koppel and Nightline have done some wonderful and important shows on race, but unless in the long term it is reported in the context of a comprehensive economic approach, it will not markedly improve race relations in America. In fact, in an unintended way, it may even add to the frustrations and to the tensions by reflecting a lack of progress on the racial front.

The problem is that we cannot make real progress on the race question in economic isolation. The race problem must be solved in the context of providing employment, health care, housing, education, and a fair share of wealth and income to all of America's people.

If we attempt to deal with the race question outside of the economic context, we are engaging in entertainment, because we cannot make systematic progress in race relations under these conditions. What often happens is that television ends up, since the networks must be concerned with ratings, not educating people about race but using race to entertain them instead, and unfortunately this is often done in the most sensational manner.

That is why I say that the O.J. Simpson trials have basically been about race entertainment, not about racial

education or racial reconciliation. What could be more sensational and off the point than substantively dealing with the state of current race relations in America than the O.J. Simpson trials? Star black male athlete alleged to have murdered his beautiful blonde white wife.

There is more racial understanding and racial reconciliation possible in 1 year, Mr. Speaker, of full employment than there is in three decades of talking about race on television, no matter how well-intentioned, how well done or how well researched.

Sensationalizing race in the current economic climate can only increase tension, add to frustration, increase cynicism, and eventually contribute to drug use and scapegoating, where people implode and turn on each other rather than to each other.

Racial justice is not the same as economic justice. There would still be racism in a full employment economy. But systematic and steady racial progress can only be achieved in the context of a full employment economy, and it would only be achieved to the degree that we as a nation make progress on economic issues.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, that is why I always say the Federal Reserve Board and the Federal Reserve System must become part of the racial justice dialog. Every time unemployment dips below 5 percent, Chairman Greenspan uses employment growth to say that the economy is overheating and as a rationale to raise interest rates, slow the economy and raise unemployment.

I oppose the Democratic welfare reform bill. I oppose the Republican welfare reform bill. I thought it was horrible when the President of the United States said that he was going to support the welfare reform bill and 98 Democrats voted for it and 98 Democrats voted against it. But let us assume, since it is a matter of law now, and it is a horrible bill that still needs correction by this body, let us assume for a moment that we are going to move people genuinely from welfare to work.

Who is on welfare? People who are unemployed or people who are underemployed? Let us assume that they are part of the 5 percent, the very bottom of our Nation's economy, those with whom the social safety net of this country was designed to protect. Two years and you are off, we say in the bill. But let us say for the very first time because the Dow Jones industrial average is now above the 6,000 mark, that the economy is now beginning to reach the unemployed and the underemployed for the very first time. Let us say that the opportunities that the President talks about in his State of the Union Address, 10 million new jobs, now at 11 million new jobs, let us say that those jobs are finally beginning to reach the unemployed and the underemployed for the first time. As soon as unemployment in our Nation dips beneath 5 percent, the Federal Reserve

and its chairman has a press conference, and the very first thing they say is, "The economy is overheating, we've got to slow the economy down, we've got to jack up interest rates, we've got to slow the economy down," and, therefore, this institution, along with the Federal Reserve, creates a permanent class of poverty in our Nation without any more government assistance.

Shame on us, Mr. Speaker. Shame on Democrats and Republicans who do not recognize and will not acknowledge that the Federal Reserve Board has a unique and an integral role to play in racial reconciliation, because jobs that have never been and have been eliminated from a generation of people are not reaching them.

Even definitions must become part of the racial justice dialog. That is why we need Presidential leadership. The politically motivated movement to redefine the Consumer Price Index, lowering the Consumer Price Index in order to reduce the budget deficit, will have a negative effect on the lives of real Americans, but disproportionately on the lives of people of color. It will impact race relations. It is not a conversation for just Wall Street or a bunch of economists. This is serious business.

Similarly, Mr. Speaker, even the way we define full employment affects race relations. "Oh, Jesse," Members on the other side walk up to me all the time, Democrats walk up to me all the time, shake my hand, "Hey, Jesse, I marched with your dad"; "Hey, Jesse, been there with you"; "You're so right, friend," but constantly vote against everything I am for.

It does not make sense, Mr. Speaker. It sure feels good, but we are not making any progress. In 1971, when Richard Nixon was President, unemployment had risen to just over 5 percent. At that time, our Nation defined 3 percent as full employment. He thought, Mr. Nixon, that 5 percent might cost him the election in 1972, so what did he do in August of 1971? He took an action traditionally attributed to Democratic officials and imposed wage-and-price controls. He jawboned the Federal Reserve to lower interest rates, and it worked. By November of 1972, the economy was booming, employment had dramatically risen, and he was overwhelmingly reelected.

They accused George McGovern of losing the election because he was too liberal. The fact of the matter is Richard Nixon won reelection because he was the liberal. He challenged the Federal Reserve, and he moved unemployment back to a number that was more acceptable by the American people.

In 1997, however, we are no longer at 3 percent. We are at 5 percent. And every time finally the underemployed get an opportunity, they jawbone the economy and start moving the economy in an opposite direction.

We must challenge, Mr. Speaker, the media, political, labor, and other leaders to transform the national discussion and debate from mere racial justice for minorities to greater racial justice for minorities in the context of greater economic justice for all Americans.

Dr. King's dream was poetic and it was symbolic. Dr. King's substance was a nonviolent, activist, economic strategy to combat racism and bring about racial reconciliation. That is why he moved from just talking about racial justice to talking about racial reconciliation in the context of an economic justice movement.

In 1968 when he was killed, he was not fighting for civil rights. That bill was passed in 1964, and he was not sleeping for 4 years. What was he doing in 1968? He was leading a poor people's campaign that paralleled the national Presidential campaign because he wanted the Nation's priorities to reflect raising boats that were stuck at the bottom.

In a nation with the economic ability and the technological capability of providing every American with a decent life, it is an outrage and it is a scandal that there should be such social misery in our country.

What do we say to the American poor and to the victims of racism and sexism and classism in America? Do we tell them, Mr. Speaker, that you are better off than the Russian poor? You are better off than the Bosnian poor? You are better off than the Asian poor, the African poor, the Latin poor? This, Mr. Speaker, has got to be close to cruel and insensitive and immoral.

No, we must tell them that such injustice is intolerable. That no American should be institutionally and systematically maimed in body and in spirit when our country has the means of doing better. The standard is not a comparison of how much worse things could be, but how much better things should be if we had only the political leadership and the development of the political will to change.

We are a nation, Mr. Speaker, of enormous national wealth that is tragically suffering from an anemia of national will to do what we know is just. It is time to end race entertainment, and it is time to start down the sure path of economic and racial justice.

#### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DICKEY). Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 43 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1700

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. DICKEY) at 5 p.m.

#### COMMEMORATING BLACK HISTORY MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentlewoman from California [Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Mr. Speaker, let me first thank our chairwoman, Congressman MAXINE WATERS, the gentlewoman from California, for her leadership and tenacity in moving forthwith on critical issues of importance, not only to African-Americans, but to all Americans, and to our revered and preeminent leader, the gentleman from Ohio, Congressman LOUIS STOKES, for the guidance in advising those of us who have come recently to this House to do the people's business. My thanks to both of my colleagues for allowing me these moments to reflect.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today as a proud African American to acknowledge this month as African American History Month and to recognize the vast contributions made by distinguished citizens of this Nation who are of African descent.

As we hold our forbearers to high esteem for their courage, perseverance, morality and faith, we salute them for their relentless efforts in fighting to remove the legal and political disabilities that were imposed upon us.

While I represent California's 37th Congressional District with pride, my birth State is Alabama, and I am reminded of the first African American from Alabama who was elected to the 42d Congress and who advocated even then the importance of education, Benjamin Sterling Turner.

Education has been the cornerstone in the African American community. My father, Rev. Shelley Millender, Sr., knew the importance of education. He and my mother, Mrs. Evelena Deutsche Millender advocated a quality education and gave us a value system that is part and parcel of the true spirit of African American families. We recognize that a good education is the key to success and should open the door of opportunity.

I am further reminded of my father's teachings when he said, never subordinate to race-bashing; respect yourself and others, even though you have differences of opinion, but hold firm to your convictions.

Let us not forget one who had strong convictions in the name of Wiley Branton, now deceased, but who was a great American and a great leader in the early civil rights movements. He was born and reared in Pine Bluff, AR, became a lawyer, and began practicing law in his hometown. His earliest achievements, however, was of national interest, as he represented the Little Rock Nine in 1958. He later became the Assistant Attorney General for Civil Rights, being appointed by the President, then Lyndon Johnson. He served as the dean of Howard University School of Law until his death. Convictions like that and convictions like

Branton is but one of the various teachings of commitment and dedication that the African American family instills in their children.

As I listened very closely to the President's State of the Union Address, as he spoke of education as a No. 1 priority, building strong families and communities, and humanitarian efforts in the assistance of the underprivileged through volunteerism, I stand tonight to lift up some of my constituents who are role models and great citizens that the President talked about. Their names will never be in lights nor on billboards, but they are the unsung heroes of my community. They helped in the education of our children, they built strong families and engaging communities, and they taught us to have a strong value system. Let me share with you these outstanding African American individuals.

Theresa LaVerne Harris who passed away in November 1996 was a dedicated educator. Throughout her life Theresa LaVerne touched all of us who had the pleasure of knowing her with her humor, her strength and, perhaps most importantly, her dignity. But she never forgot that education was the key, and therefore she became an educator and an administrator with the Los Angeles Unified School District. She spent her early youth in Louisiana and Mississippi until her family moved to California in 1943. She attended the Los Angeles unified schools and graduated from John Francis Polytechnic High School with honors. But it was during her college days at UCLA that she decided to become this educator.

Theresa LaVerne began a long distinguished life educating the young kids from the inner city. She excelled in her career as an educator. Though she raised three outstanding children, she was a loving and supportive wife, and in spite of all of this, she went on to earn a master's degree in personnel administration from Pepperdine University.

But both as an educator and an administrator within a public school system, Theresa LaVerne worked hard to ensure that students under her charge had the very best of education available to them. While she was deservedly proud of her mark as a personal and academic woman of achievements, she was more interested in using her talents and her strength to help children to become better educated and to ensure their mark in the future in mainstreaming them into the world of work.

Those of us who worked around her saw that she was a very strong disciplinarian in her efforts to make sure that education stayed the primary responsibility of those teachers and administrators who worked under her watch.

Mr. Speaker, I worked with Theresa LaVerne Harris and had the privilege of knowing her and her family for decades. She was a devoted wife, a wonderful and nurturing mother, a role model not only for our children, but for all of

us who had the opportunity to know her. She will be sorely missed, and as I said a moment ago, she was one who was a person who did extraordinary work in the field of education and educating our children.

The next person I will speak of is Carolyn Ann Richardson Cheney, a woman of immense talents. Carolyn passed away in December 1996, and she too was a devoted family and community leader. She had a generosity of spirit in giving all that she could to the community and to inspire those who worked around her. Those of us who knew her knew that she spent her early days as a youth in El Paso, TX, before moving to California. After graduating from high school she obtained a dental assistance credential and began working in Los Angeles. Her further thirst for education prompted her to go on to Compton College, where she earned her associate arts degree and on to California State University, Dominguez Hills where she finished her bachelor's degree with honors.

What do these two people have in common? In spite of being mothers and in spite of being wives, they obtained their education and went on to help others outside of their children. Carolyn's ambition, strength, and motivation found expressions in her entrepreneurial and managerial talents. For 13 years she worked in Sears & Roebuck during off times to help with the family finances.

In 1980, she opened her own insurance agency, and it became one of the top agencies in southern California, and despite all of this she found time to serve her community and her church, reaching out to teenage mothers, reaching out to the desolate, reaching out to those who were the homeless. She volunteered in the Los Angeles probation department in the chaplain's office. Carolyn received the Paul Harris Fellowship by the Rotary International in appreciation for her efforts and assistance in the furtherance of better understanding and friendly relationships among peoples throughout the world.

Though she was a loving and devoted mother of 4 children, through words and deeds, she instilled in them the principle of honesty, integrity, hard work, perseverance, and self-sacrifice. And these are the values that help to make our Nation great and our people strong. Her attributes are a testament to the unending strength of motherhood. Carolyn will be sorely missed by all of those and all of us who knew her for her nurturing, her leadership, and her strength. She indeed was an inspiration to all of us throughout the community.

I pay homage to Mr. Sam Littleton, who passed away January 31 of this year. Mr. Littleton went to work early as a mail carrier in the cities of Los Angeles and Compton until he was stricken with disability. But his disability did not dissuade him to go on in his middle age to college, having received an AA degree from Compton

College and a bachelor's degree from Los Angeles University of Los Angeles. But he was still motivated for higher education and he applied and was accepted to the graduate program of social work at UCLA.

When he became a social worker, he started work at the new then-Martin Luther King, Jr., Medical Center. He elected to not work as a social worker in the daytime, but he elected to work as a social worker at night so that those who worked during the day, parents, single parents, and those who could not get off at work could come and talk with him, and he counseled them. He was the only social worker in the State of California who took an evening shift. He was a positive and unique role model for the community. He served and assisted with the bereaved and grieving families; he assisted many homeless persons in finding shelter; he counseled many with abuse problems and substance abuse as well, and he even counseled women who were victims of rape. The elderly grew to know him as a person whom they could depend upon because he would make home visits to make sure that they felt safe in their homes and that their needs were met even though they could not come out from their homes.

Yes, his 18 years of service as an evening social worker endeared him to not only his family, but to employees and coworkers and the community around him. He will be sorely missed, but his legacy remains.

I salute Mr. Sam Littleton for an outstanding record of public and community service, a record that has touched so many lives throughout the community. He was truly an inspiration to all of us. His community commitment, his dedication to human services, his social services and service to the community through volunteerism were indeed the life and the high regard that was given to him at the time of his funeral on January 31.

Another person who is not deceased yet, of course, is Maxie Filer, who has given 45 years of public service to the community. Mr. Filer is in the Guinness Book of Records because he took the law exam 45 times before he passed. Perseverance. He was indeed a role model and is a role model to the community.

While he has 7 children, 3 of whom are attorneys and one is a judge, Mr. Filer knew the importance of public service. He was a resident of Compton for over 40-some years. He served in presidential campaigns; he was the president of the Compton Democratic Club in 1952. He was labor and industry community chairman. He was even with Martin King on the march on Washington in 1963, and he became the president of the Compton NAACP from 1964 to 1970. Mr. Filer served as a Compton city council member from 1976 through 1989.

His commitment, though, to the youth, the African-American males, is one indication of a man who knew out-

side of being a father to his 7 children, along with his wife, Glendell, that he had to help young African-American males to see the right way, to move into a mainstream of life and to divert from gangs and drugs.

He is still serving in the community as an attorney and does a lot of pro bono work for those in the community who are unable to pay for legal service. Maxie Filer is one who now recognizes volunteerism is an important component. He will serve as my chairperson for my volunteerism task force that I am convening.

□ 1715

Mr. Speaker, as new trailblazers emerge to chart new paths, and they commence agendas to promote African-Americans and invest in future generations, let us never forget the spirit of those who I have mentioned, and our forebears.

Let us also recognize the ones whose names do not ripple in neon lights, whose distinctiveness has yet to be embedded on printed pages. Because for all that we are and hope to be, it is because of them. For all of the songs that they sang over stovetops and beside washtubs that went unscored, for all the poems that they scribbled on matchboxes and matchbox covers and on dinner napkins that went unpublished and unnoticed, for the many discovered roles that they played in unrecorded and then forgotten movies, and for all that they did for us, we are all the better because of them.

We want them to know that they will not go unnoticed, because each time we sign our names, we know that it is for the thousand like them who cannot hold a pen, but instead, held us, and tucked us in gently, as they sang the many rhythms and rhymes of the old African spirituals.

Mr. Speaker, I have come tonight because I wanted to recognize not just those of us who perhaps in the eyes of others have succeeded, but for the many who perhaps will not ever work in this Chamber, will not ever have an opportunity to run campaigns, but they, too, have given so much to this Nation and to this world.

As we celebrate African-American History Month, let us not forget those who toiled in order that we would have a place in this House.

#### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DICKEY). Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the House stands in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 19 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1806

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro

tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE) at 6 o'clock and 6 minutes p.m.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 21. Concurrent Resolution providing for an adjournment of both Houses.

The message also announced that the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the following joint committees of Congress:

Joint Committee on Printing: JOHN WARNER; THAD COCHRAN; MITCH MCCONNELL; WENDELL H. FORD; and DANIEL L. INOUE.

Joint Committee on the Library of Congress: TED STEVENS; JOHN WARNER; THAD COCHRAN; DANIEL PATRICK MOYNIHAN; and DIANNE FEINSTEIN.

The message also announced that pursuant to sections 1928a-1928d of title 22, United States Code, as amended, the Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, appoints the Senator from Delaware [Mr. ROTH] as chairman of the Senate Delegation to the North Atlantic Assembly during the One Hundred Fifth Congress.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 94-304, as amended by Public Law 99-7, the Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, appoints the Senator from New York [Mr. D'AMATO] as chairman of the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 102-138, the Chair, on behalf of the President pro tempore, and upon the recommendation of the majority leader, appoints the Senator from Alaska [Mr. STEVENS] as chairman of the Senate Delegation to the British-American Interparliamentary Group during the One Hundred Fifth Congress.

The message also announced that pursuant to sections 276d-276g of title 22, United States Code, as amended, the Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, appoints the Senator from Alaska [Mr. MURKOWSKI] as chairman of the Senate Delegation to the Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group during the One Hundred Fifth Congress.

The message also announced that pursuant to sections 276h-276k of title 22, United States Code, as amended, the Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, appoints the Senator from Texas [Mrs. HUTCHISON] as chairman of the Senate Delegation to the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group during the One Hundred Fifth Congress.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. FILNER) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. FILNER, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SHIMKUS) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. KNOLLENBERG, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. METCALF, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MCINTOSH, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BEREUTER, for 5 minutes, today.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. KLECZKA, and to include therein extraneous material, notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds five pages of the RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost \$1,152.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 21, 105th Congress, the House stands adjourned until 12:30 p.m. on Tuesday, February 25, 1997, for morning hour debate.

Thereupon (at 6 o'clock and 7 minutes p.m.), pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 21, the House adjourned until Tuesday, February 25, 1997, at 12:30 p.m.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1747. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Walnuts Grown in California; Assessment Rate [Docket No. FV96-984-1 FIR] received February 11, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1748. A letter from the Acting Executive Director, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Reports by Large Traders; Cash Position Reports in Grains (Including Soybeans) and Cotton [17 CFR Parts 15, 18, and 19] received February 13, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1749. A letter from the Director of the Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Bifenthrin; Pesticide Tolerances for Emergency Exemptions [OPP-300452; FRL-5585-1] (RIN: 2070-AB78) received February 11, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1750. A letter from the Administrator, Farm Service Agency, transmitting the Agency's "Major" final rule—Conservation Reserve Program—Long-Term Policy [7 CFR

Part 704] (RIN: 0560-AE95) received February 12, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1751. A letter from the Administrator, Rural Utilities Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Pre-Loan Procedures for Electric Loans (RIN: 0572-AB30) received February 13, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1752. A letter from the Under Secretary for Acquisition and Technology, Department of Defense, transmitting the report to Congress for Department of Defense purchases from foreign entities in fiscal year 1996, pursuant to Public Law 104-201, section 827 (110 Stat. 2611); to the Committee on National Security.

1753. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's report on the efficacy of court-martial sentence enhancement based on the status of victims; to the Committee on National Security.

1754. A letter from the Director of the Office of Legislative Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule—Expanded Examination Cycle for Certain Small Insured Institutions [12 CFR Part 337] (RIN: 3064-AB90) received February 13, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

1755. A letter from the Acting General Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Identification and Mapping of Special Flood Hazard Areas, Procedures for Map Correction, and Procedures and Fees for Processing Map Changes (RIN: 3067-AC53) received February 13, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

1756. A letter from the Managing Director, Federal Housing Finance Board, transmitting the Board's final rule—Technical Amendment to Definition of Deposits in Banks or Trust Companies [No. 97-3] received February 13, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

1757. A letter from the Chairman of the Board, National Credit Union Administration, transmitting the Administration's pay structure for 1997, pursuant to Public Law 101-73, section 1206 (103 Stat. 523); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

1758. A letter from the Legislative and Regulatory Activities Division, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, transmitting the Office's final rule—Expanded Examination Cycle for Certain Small Insured Institutions [Docket No. 97-02] (RIN: 1557-AB56) received February 10, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

1759. A letter from the Deputy Executive Director and Chief Operating Officer, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule—Allocation of Assets in Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumption for Valuing Benefits [29 CFR Part 4044] received February 10, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

1760. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's report on the pension counseling demonstration program, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 3035r(f)(2); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

1761. A letter from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting the Department's report entitled "Process-Oriented Industrial Energy Efficiency and Industrial Insulation and Audit Guidelines", pursuant to Public Law 102-486, section 132(d) (106 Stat. 2839); to the Committee on Commerce.

1762. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule—Acquisition Regulation: Technical Amendments (RIN: 1991-AB34) received February 7, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

1763. A letter from the Director of the Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Military Munitions Rule: Hazardous Waste Identification and Management; Explosives Emergencies; Manifest Exemption for Transport of Hazardous Waste on Right-of-ways on Contiguous Properties [EPA 530-Z-95-013; FRL-5686-4] (RIN: 2050-AD90) received February 6, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

1764. A letter from the Director of the Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Regulations of Fuels and Fuel Additives: Extension of the Reformulated Gasoline Program to the Phoenix, Arizona Moderate Ozone Nonattainment Area [FRL-5689-2] received February 13, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

1765. A letter from the Director of the Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Clean Air Act Promulgation of Extension of Attainment Date for the Pittsburgh-Beaver Valley, Pennsylvania Moderate Ozone Nonattainment Area; and Determination of Valid Ozone Air Quality Data Indicating the Reading, Pennsylvania and Richmond, Virginia Moderate Ozone Nonattainment Areas Have Attained the Nation Ambient Air Quality Standard for Ozone [PA 034-4054a; FRL-5688-7] received February 13, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

1766. A letter from the Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting a copy of the Agency's report entitled "Status of the State Small Business Stationary Source Technical and Environmental Compliance Assistance Programs [SBTCP] for the Reporting Period, January–December 1995," pursuant to section 507(d) of the Clear Air Act Amendments of 1990; to the Committee on Commerce.

1767. A letter from the Managing Director, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Regulation of International Accounting Rates [Docket No. CC 90-337, Part II] received February 11, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

1768. A letter from the Chair, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting a report on the status of all extensions authorized by Congress of the hydropower construction deadlines of section 13 of the Federal Power Act, pursuant to section 1701(c)(5) of the Energy Policy Act of 1992; to the Committee on Commerce.

1769. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy Management Staff, Office of Policy, Food and Drug Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Food Labeling: saccharin and Its Salts; Retail Establishment Notice [Docket No. 95P-0337] received February 13, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

1770. A letter from the Director of the Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—USEC Privatization Act [10 CFR Parts 2, 40, 70, and 76] (RIN: 3150-AF56) received February 11, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

1771. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report

on the National Practitioner Data Bank [NPDB] malpractice reporting requirements, pursuant to Public Law 99-660, section 421(d); to the Committee on Commerce.

1772. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's "Major" final rule—Reporting Requirements for Brokers or Dealers Under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 [Release No. 34-38245; File No. S7-21-93] (RIN: 3235-AF91) received February 7, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

1773. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Net Capital Rule [Release No. 34-38248; File No. S7-7-94] (RIN: 3235-AG14) received February 7, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

1774. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles or defense services sold commercially to Israel (Transmittal No. MC-DTC-23-97), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

1775. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles or defense services sold commercially to Israel and the United Kingdom (Transmittal No. DTC-24-97), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

1776. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles or defense services sold commercially to the United Kingdom (Transmittal No. DTC-21-97), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

1777. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles or defense services sold commercially to the United Kingdom (Transmittal No. DTC-22-97), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

1778. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting notification of a proposed manufacturing license agreement for production of major military equipment with Germany (transmittal No. DTC-17-97), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(d); to the Committee on International Relations.

1779. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting notification of a proposed manufacturing license agreement for production of major military equipment with Turkey (Transmittal No. DTC-8-97), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(d); to the Committee on International Relations.

1780. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting the bi-monthly report on progress toward a negotiated settlement of the Cyprus question, including any relevant reports from the Secretary General of the United Nations, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2373(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

1781. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting copies of international agreements, other than treaties, entered into by the United States, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b(a); to the Committee on International Relations.

1782. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report on the progress made toward opening the United States Embassy in Jerusalem, pursuant to Public Law 104-45,

section 6 (109 Stat. 400); to the Committee on International Relations.

1783. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule—Revisions to the Commerce Control List: Exports of Mixtures Containing Trace Quantities of Precursor Chemicals; ECCNs 1C350 and 1C995 [Docket No. 961206342-6342-01] (RIN: 0694-AB46) received February 7, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on International Relations.

1784. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule—Revisions to the Export Administration Regulations: Addition of the Republic of South Korea to Australia Group (AG), Clarification to the Sample Shipments Exemption in ECCN 1C350, and Correction to the Commerce Country Chart [Docket No. 961219362-6362-01] (RIN: 0694-AB52) received February 7, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on International Relations.

1785. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize payment of arrears to the United Nations, U.N. specialized agencies, and other international organizations; to the Committee on International Relations.

1786. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General, General Accounting Office, transmitting the Comptroller General's 1996 annual report, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 719(a); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

1787. A letter from the Director, Operations and Finance, American Battle Monuments Commission, transmitting a report of activities under the Freedom of Information Act for the calendar year 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

1788. A letter from the Manager, Benefits Communications, Ninth Farm Credit District Trust Committee, transmitting the annual report for the plan year ended December 31, 1995, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 9503(a)(1)(B); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

1789. A letter from the Chairman, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting a copy of the annual report in compliance with the Government in the Sunshine Act during the calendar year 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b(j); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

1790. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's final rule—Funding of Administrative Law Judge Examination [5 CFR Part 930] (RIN: 3206-AH31) received February 13, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

1791. A letter from the Associate Director for Management, Peace Corps, transmitting a notice of an amendment to the system of records, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552a; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

1792. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule—Migratory Bird Hunting; Late Seasons and Bag and Possession Limits for Certain Migratory Game Birds; Supplemental [50 CFR Part 20] (RIN: 1018-AD69) received February 11, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

1793. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule—Importation of Polar Bear Trophies from Canada under the 1994 Amendments to the Marine Mammal Protection



Act (RIN: 1018-AD04) received February 13, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

1794. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pollock in Statistical Area 620 [Docket No. 961126333-6333-01; I.D. 020597A] received February 11, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

1795. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration final rule—Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Atka Mackerel in the Eastern Aleutian District and Bering Sea Subarea of the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands [Docket No. 961114318-6318-01; I.D. 02397F] received February 11, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

1796. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration final rule—Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Scallop Fishery; Closure in Registration Area E [Docket No. 960502124-6190-02; I.D. 012497B] received February 11, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

1797. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration final rule—Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pollock in Statistical Area 630 [Docket No. 961126333-6333-01; I.D. 020297D] received February 11, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

1798. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration final rule—North Atlantic Right Whale Protection [Docket No. 960730211-7020-02; I.D. 072296B] received February 11, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

1799. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Civil Monetary Penalty Inflation Adjustment (National Highway Traffic Safety Administration) [Docket No. 97-2; Notice 1] (RIN: 2105-AC63) received February 10, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1800. A letter from the Director, Federal Bureau of Prisons, transmitting the Bureau's final rule—Research [BOP-1008-F] (RIN: 1120-AA14) received February 10, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1801. A letter from the Director, Federal Bureau of Prisons, transmitting the Bureau's final rule—Inmate Legal Activities and Inmate Personal Property [BOP 1063-F] (RIN: 1120-AA58) received February 10, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1802. A letter from the Secretary, Judicial Conference of the United States, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to partially restore compensation levels to their past equivalent in terms of real income and establish the procedure for adjusting future compensation of justices and judges of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1803. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Federal Aviation Administration, transmitting a copy of the updated aviation system capital investment plan [CIP] pursu-

ant to 49 U.S.C. app. 2203 (b) (1); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1804. A letter from the Director of Civil Works, Department of the Army, transmitting the Department's final rule—Final Notice of Issuance, Reissuance, and Modification of Nationwide Permits—received February 10, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1805. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Saab Model SAAB 2000 Series Airplanes (Federal Aviation Administration) [Docket No. 96-NM-233-AD; Amdt. 39-9916; AD 97-03-11] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 10, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1806. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Model DC-9 and Model DC-9-80 Series Airplanes, Model MD-88 Airplanes, and C-9 (Military) Series Airplanes Equipped with BF Goodrich Evacuation Slides (Federal Aviation Administration) [Docket No. 96-NM-124-AD; Amdt. 39-9920; AD 97-03-15] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 10, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1807. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Jetstream Model 4101 Airplanes (Federal Aviation Administration) [Docket No. 96-NM-97-AD; Amdt. 39-9917; AD 96-03-12] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 10, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1808. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directive; McDonnell Douglas Model MD-11 and MD-11F Series Airplanes (Federal Aviation Administration) [Docket No. 96-NM-218-AD; Amdt. 39-9921; AD 96-03-16] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 10, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1809. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 747 Series Airplanes (Federal Aviation Administration) [Docket No. 95-NM-226-AD; Amdt. 39-9924; AD 97-03-19] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 10, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1810. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directive; Construcciones Aeronauticas S.A. (CASA), Model C-1212 Series Airplanes (Federal Aviation Administration) [Docket No. 96-NM-890-AD; Amdt. 39-9918; AD 97-03-13] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 10, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1811. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 747 and 757 Series Airplanes (Federal Aviation Administration) [Docket No. 96-NM-57-AD; Amdt. 39-9922; AD 97-03-17] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 10, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1812. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness

Directives; Boeing Model 737-300 Series Airplanes (Federal Aviation Administration) [Docket No. 96-NM-148-AD; Amdt. 39-9919; AD 97-03-14] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 10, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1813. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce plc RB211-535E4 and -535E4-B Series Turbofan Engines (Federal Aviation Administration) [Docket No. 96-ANE-09; Amdt. 39-9897; AD 97-02-12] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 10, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1814. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Pratt & Whitney JT8D-200 Series Turbofan Engines (Federal Aviation Administration) [Docket No. 96-ANE-33; Amdt. 39-9896; AD 97-02-11] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 10, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1815. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Pratt & Whitney JFTD12A Series and T73 Series Turbofan Engines (Federal Aviation Administration) [Docket No. 94-ANE-49; Amdt. 39-9898; AD 97-02-13] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 10, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1816. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Amendment to Class E Airspace; Lebanon, NH (Federal Aviation Administration) [Airspace Docket No. 96-ANE-28] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received February 10, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1817. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Amendment of Class E Airspace; Old Town, ME (Federal Aviation Administration) [Airspace Docket No. 96-ANE-29] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received February 10, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1818. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Amendment to Class E Airspace; New Haven, CT (Federal Aviation Administration) [Airspace Docket No. 97-ANE-02] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received February 10, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1819. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—International Data Submissions by Large Air Carriers (Form 41 Schedules T-100, T-100(f), and P-1.2) [Docket No. OST-96-1049; Notice 96-2] (RIN: 2105-AC34) received February 10, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1820. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Value Engineering (Federal Highway Administration) [FHWA Docket No. 94-12] (RIN: 2125-AD33) received February 13, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1821. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Federal Aid Project Agreement and Contract Procedures (Federal Highway Administration) [FHWA Docket No. 96-3] (RIN: 2125-AD58) received February 13, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C.

801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1822. A letter from the Commandant, United States Coast Guard, transmitting the Coast Guard's report entitled "International Private-Sector Tug-of-Opportunity System for the Waters of the Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary and the Strait of Juan de Fuca," pursuant to Public Law 104-58, section 401(a) (109 Stat. 566); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1823. A letter from the Director of the Office of Regulations Management, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule—VA Homeless Providers Grant and Per Diem Program Clarification of Per Diem Eligibility (RIN: 2900-AH89) received February 10, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1824. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Rulings and Determination Letters [Rev. Proc. 97-17] received February 12, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1825. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Social Security Administration, transmitting the Administration's "Major" final rule—Supplemental Security Income; Determining Disability for a Child Under Age 18; Interim Final Rules With Request for Comments [Regulations Nos. 4 and 16] (RIN: 0960-AE57) received February 12, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1826. A letter from the Comptroller, Department of Defense, transmitting a report on the amount of any contribution accepted for relocation of U.S. Armed Forces within that nation and the specific use of those contributions, pursuant to Public Law 104-106, section 1332(a)(1) (110 Stat. 483); jointly, to the Committees on National Security and International Relations.

1827. A letter from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting the semiannual report regarding programs for the protection, control, and accountability of fissile materials in the countries of the former Soviet Union, pursuant to Public Law 104-106, section 3131(b) (110 Stat. 617); jointly, to the Committees on National Security and International Relations.

1828. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Defense, transmitting a notification that the advisory committee appointed to study the appropriate forum for criminal law jurisdiction over civilians accompanying the Armed Forces in the field outside the United States in time of armed conflict has been unable to finish its report prior to the statutory deadline, pursuant to Public Law 104-106, section 1151(d)(2) (110 Stat. 468); jointly, to the Committees on National Security and the Judiciary.

1829. A letter from the Chief of Staff, The White House, transmitting certification that no person or persons with direct or indirect responsibility for administering the Executive Office of the President's Drug Free Workplace Plan are themselves subject to a program of individual random drug testing, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 7301 note; jointly, to the Committees on Government Reform and Oversight and Appropriations.

1830. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General, General Accounting Office, transmitting a report on the two General Accounting Office employees detailed to congressional committees as of January 17, 1997; jointly, to the Committees on Government Reform and Oversight and Appropriations.

1831. A letter from the Assistant Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting a report on the agency's steady progress in meeting the challenge of the new Safe Drinking Water Act Amendments of

1996; jointly, to the Committees on Commerce, Transportation and Infrastructure, and Science.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ARCHER: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 668. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reinstate the airport and airway trust fund excise taxes, and for other purposes (Rept. 105-5). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MCGOVERN:

H.R. 744. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to increase the maximum Pell Grant; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. DEFAZIO (for himself, Mr. PETRI, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. PORTER, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. EVANS, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. DOYLE, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. HINCHAY, and Mr. LEVIN):

H.R. 745. A bill to deauthorize the Animas-La Plata Federal reclamation project, and to direct the Secretary of the Interior to enter into negotiations to satisfy, in a manner consistent with all Federal laws, the water rights interests of the Ute Mountain Ute Indian Tribe and the Southern Ute Indian Tribe; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. DEFAZIO (for himself, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. EVANS, Mr. HINCHAY, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. STUMP, Ms. NORTON, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. OWENS, Mrs. CHENOWETH, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. HEFLEY, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. COX of California, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. FURSE, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. DREIER, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Ms. JACKSON-LEE, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. RUSH, Mr. TALENT, Mr. WYNN, Mr. FILNER, Mr. DEUTSCH, and Mr. BURTON of Indiana):

H.R. 746. A bill to allow patients to receive any medical treatment they want under certain conditions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. MCCOLLUM (for himself, Mr. DEUTSCH, and Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO):

H.R. 747. A bill to require notification of the interstate relocation of a witness by State engaging in that relocation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCCOLLUM (for himself and Mr. SCHUMER):

H.R. 748. A bill to amend the prohibition of title 18, United States Code, against financial transactions with terrorists; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ABERCROMBIE (for himself and Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA):

H.R. 749. A bill to amend the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act

to provide for improved notification and consent, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. BEREUTER (for himself, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, Mr. DREIER, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. CRANE, Mr. SALMON, Mr. KOLBE, and Mr. COX of California):

H.R. 750. A bill to support the autonomous governance of Hong Kong after its reversion to the People's Republic of China; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. CHABOT (for himself, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Ms. NORTON, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. OLVER, Mr. RAHALL, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, and Ms. JACKSON-LEE):

H.R. 751. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for research on the disease known as lymphangioleiomyomatosis, commonly known as LAM; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mrs. CHENOWETH (for herself, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. SMITH of Oregon, Mr. POMBO, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. RIGGS, Mr. BONO, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. SAM JOHNSON, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. STUMP, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. MCINTOSH, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. HERGER, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. SNOWBARGER, Mr. DICKEY, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. CANNON, Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. NEUMANN, Mr. HILL, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. METCALF, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. CRANE, Mr. BARR of Georgia, Mr. COOKSEY, Mr. NEY, Mr. DELAY, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. BONILLA, and Mr. MCKEON):

H.R. 752. A bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to ensure that persons that suffer or are threatened with injury resulting from a violation of the act or a failure of the Secretary to act in accordance with the act have standing to commence a civil suit on their own behalf; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. CONYERS (for himself, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. FARR of California, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. STARK, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HINCHAY, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. FILNER, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. NADLER, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. WATT of North Carolina, Mr. YATES, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. OLVER, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. PASTOR, and Ms. VELAZQUEZ):

H.R. 753. A bill to require a separate, unclassified statement of the aggregate amount of budget outlays for intelligence activities; to the Committee on the Budget, and in addition to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select), for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DEFAZIO (for himself, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. HINCHAY, Mr. FILNER, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. NADLER, Mr. EVANS, Mr. HORN, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Ms. NORTON, Ms. JACKSON-LEE, Mr. RAHALL, Mrs. CARSON,

Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. MAS-CARA, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. LANTOS, Ms. PELOSI, and Mr. DAN SCHAEFER of Colorado):

H.R. 754. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to require the use of child safety restraint systems approved by the Secretary of Transportation on commercial aircraft; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. DUNCAN (for himself, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. HEFLEY, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ, Mr. GORDON, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. BAKER, Mr. WAMP, Ms. NORTON, Mr. SPRATT, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. LATOURETTE, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. REGULA, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. DAN SCHAEFER of Colorado, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. FALCOMA, Mr. EHLERS, Mrs. LINDA SMITH of Washington, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. BEREUTER, and Mr. JENKINS):

H.R. 755. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow individuals to designate any portion of their income tax overpayments, and to make other contributions, for the benefit of units of the National Park System; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. EHRLICH:

H.R. 756. A bill to establish a National Physical Fitness and Sports Foundation to carry out activities to support and supplement the mission of the President's Council on Physical Fitness and Sports, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. FALCOMA:

H.R. 757. A bill to develop the economy of American Samoa; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. FAWELL (for himself, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. SAM JOHNSON, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. RIGGS, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. MCINTOSH, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. DICKEY, Mr. EHRLICH, Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. HERGER, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. WICKER, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. SNOWBARGER, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. LINDER, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. PAXON, Mr. PITTS, Mr. DAN SCHAEFER of Colorado, Mr. CANADY of Florida, Mr. HILL, Mr. HUTCHINSON, and Mr. NETHERCUTT):

H.R. 758. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to protect employer rights; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. FILNER:

H.R. 759. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase certain rates of educational assistance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mrs. CARSON, Ms. JACKSON-LEE, and Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ):

H.R. 760. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act and Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to require that group and individual health insurance coverage and group health plans provide coverage for screening mammography and pap smears; to the Committee on Commerce, and

in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts:

H.R. 761. A bill to amend title IV of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 to extend the 1-year transition from disqualification for a current welfare recipient while the recipient's naturalization application is pending; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HANSEN (for himself, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. EHLERS, Ms. FURSE, Mr. MCINNIS, and Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts):

H.R. 762. A bill to restrict the advertising and promotion of tobacco products; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HOUGHTON (for himself and Mr. RANGEL):

H.R. 763. A bill to establish for certain employees of international organizations an estate tax credit equivalent to the limited marital deduction; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HYDE (for himself, Mr. GEKAS, and Mr. MCCOLLUM):

H.R. 764. A bill to make technical corrections to title 11, United States Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JONES:

H.R. 765. A bill to ensure maintenance of a herd of wild horses in Cape Lookout National Seashore; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mrs. KENNELLY of Connecticut (for herself, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mrs. CARSON, Ms. JACKSON-LEE, Ms. KAPTUR, Mrs. LOWEY, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mrs. MORELLA, and Ms. FURSE):

H.R. 766. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide comprehensive pension protection for women; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Education and the Workforce, Transportation and Infrastructure, and Government Reform and Oversight, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KNOLLENBERG:

H.R. 767. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to require candidates for election for the House of Representatives or the Senate to raise at least 65 percent of their contributions from individuals residing in the district or State involved, to limit the amount of contributions such candidates may accept from multicandidate political committees, and to prohibit individuals who are ineligible to register to vote in Federal elections from making contributions to candidates or political parties; to the Committee on House Oversight.

By Mr. LAHOOD (for himself, Mr. EHRLICH, and Mr. MARTINEZ):

H.R. 768. A bill to restrict the Food and Drug Administration from penalizing retailers for face-to-face tobacco sales that are in accordance with State law; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. LANTOS (for himself and Mr. SHAYS):

H.R. 769. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act to 1949 to ensure proper classification as employees and independent contractors of persons awarded Federal procurement contracts; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

H.R. 770. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to ensure proper classification as employees and independent contractors of persons awarded Federal procurement contracts; to the Committee on National Security.

H.R. 771. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and the Revenue Act of 1978 to revise the procedures applicable to the determination of employment status; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LAZIO of New York (for himself, Mr. ACKERMAN, and Mr. FORBES):

H.R. 772. A bill to authorize the Director of the Federal Emergency Management Agency to reimburse certain State and local jurisdictions for expenses incurred in support of Federal rescue and salvage operations in connection with the crash of Trans World Airlines Flight 800; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. LEWIS of Georgia (for himself,

Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. BENTSEN, Mr. BONIOR, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. BROWN of California, Ms. CHRISTIAN-GREEN, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DIXON, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. FALCOMA, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. FILNER, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. FORD, Mr. FROST, Ms. FURSE, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. GREEN, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. JACKSON, Ms. JACKSON-LEE, Mr. JEFFERSON, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. MILLER of California, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Ms. NORTON, Mr. OLVER, Mr. OWENS, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. QUINN, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SHAYS, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. STARK, Mr. STOKES, Mr. THOMPSON, Mr. TORRES, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Ms. WATERS, Mr. WATT of North Carolina, Mr. WYNN, Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, and Ms. KILPATRICK):

H.R. 773. A bill to authorize the establishment of the National African-American Museum within the Smithsonian Institution; to the Committee on House Oversight, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. LOFGREN:

H.R. 774. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to restore freedom of speech to the Internet and to protect children from unsuitable online material; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Ms. MCKINNEY (for herself, Mr.

BONIOR, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. FILNER, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. HILLIARD, Ms. JACKSON-LEE, Ms.

EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Ms. NORTON, Mr. OWENS, Mr. RUSH, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. WATT of North Carolina, and Mr. WYNN):

H.R. 775. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to discourage American businesses from moving jobs overseas and to encourage the creating of new jobs in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. MEEK of Florida (for herself, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. BROWN of California, Mrs. CARSON, Ms. CHRISTIAN-GREEN, Mr. CLAY, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. DIXON, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. FILNER, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. FORD, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. FROST, Mr. GREEN, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. JACKSON, Ms. JACKSON-LEE, Mr. JEFFERSON, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. MILLER of California, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Ms. NORTON, Mr. OWENS, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. STARK, Mr. STOKES, Mr. THOMPSON, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. TORRES, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. WATERS, Mr. WATT of North Carolina, Mr. WEXLER, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Mr. WYNN):

H.R. 776. A bill to provide for greater accuracy in the 2000 decennial census of population, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

By Mr. FATTAH (for himself, Mr. CLAY, and Mr. KILDEE):

H.R. 777. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to establish a 21st Century Scholars Program; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. MILLER of California (for himself and Mr. RAHALL):

H.R. 778. A bill to ensure that Federal taxpayers receive a fair return for the extraction of locatable minerals on public domain lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

H.R. 779. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the percentage depletion allowance for certain hardrock mines; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 780. A bill to provide for the reclamation of abandoned hardrock mines, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. MINK of Hawaii:

H.R. 781. A bill to ensure that crop losses resulting from plant viruses and other plant diseases are covered by crop insurance and the noninsured crop assistance program and that agricultural producers who suffer such losses are eligible for emergency loans; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 782. A bill to provide for the use of private delivery services in filing documents with Federal agencies; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

H.R. 783. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to prohibit candidates for election for Federal office from

accepting unsecured loans from depository institutions regulated under Federal law, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Oversight.

By Mrs. MORELLA (for herself, Mr. HOYER, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. FROST, and Mr. GONZALEZ):

H.R. 784. A bill to save lives and prevent injuries to children in motor vehicles through improved national, State, and local child passenger protection program; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. NORWOOD (for himself, Mr. LINDER, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. KINGSTON, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. COLLINS, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. BARR of Georgia, and Mr. DEAL of Georgia):

H.R. 785. A bill to designate the J. Phil Campbell, Senior, Natural Resource Conservation Center; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. NORWOOD (for himself, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. BARR of Georgia, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. BOYD, Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky, Mr. BURR of North Carolina, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. COLLINS, Mr. COCKSEY, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. LINDER, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. WICKER, and Mr. JOHN):

H.R. 786. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act to restore the effectiveness of certain provisions regulating Federal milk marketing orders; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. OWENS:

H.R. 787. A bill to prohibit the manufacture, importation, exportation, sale, purchase, transfer, receipt, possession, or transportation of handguns and handgun ammunition, with certain exceptions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OWENS (for himself, Mr. SCHUMER, and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida):

H.R. 788. A bill to expand the powers of the Secretary of the Treasury and the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms to regulate the manufacture, distribution, and sale of firearms and ammunition, and to expand the jurisdiction of the Bureau to include firearm products and nonpowder firearms; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER (for himself, Mr. BURR of North Carolina, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. ENSIGN, Mr. MASCARA, Mr. HERGER, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. PETRI, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. PARKER, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, Mr. DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. EHRLICH, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Ms. JACKSON-LEE, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mrs. LINDA SMITH of Washington, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. STUMP, Mr. WYNN, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. BAESLER, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. WOLF, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. SKEEN, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. PORTER, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. COLLINS, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. UPTON, Mr. WELLER, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. CRANE, Mr. METCALF, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. SALMON, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. MCHALE, Mr. HORN, Mr. KLUG, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. TALENT, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, Mr. BARCIA of Michigan, Mr.

CHAMBLISS, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. MCINNIS, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. BONILLA, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. QUINN, Mr. WALSH, Mr. SAM JOHNSON, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. DICKEY, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. SESSIONS, and Mr. HOBSON):

H.R. 789. A bill to amend title 17, United States Code, with respect to certain exemptions from copyright, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POMEROY:

H.R. 790. A bill to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act to ensure the continued availability of affordable crop insurance for producers whose farms are located in counties designated as Federal disaster areas because of weather-related conditions; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. POMEROY (for himself; Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. HILL, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, and Mr. STENHOLM):

H.R. 791. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 relating to the treatment of livestock sold on account of weather-related conditions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. PRYCE of Ohio (for herself, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. HERGER, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. BARR of Georgia, Mr. NEY, Mr. KINGSTON, and Mr. FOLEY):

H.R. 792. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prevent Federal prisoners from engaging in activities to increase their strength or fighting ability while in prison; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAHALL:

H.R. 793. A bill to provide for permanent resident status for certain Persian Gulf evacuees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SABO:

H.R. 794. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to provide for public financing of House of Representatives general election campaigns, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Oversight, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SANDERS:

H.R. 795. A bill to amend the Electronic Fund Transfer Act to prohibit the imposition of certain additional fees on consumers in connection with any electronic fund transfer which is initiated by the consumer from an electronic terminal operated by a person other than the financial institution holding the consumer's account and which utilizes a national or regional communication network; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

By Mr. SANFORD:

H.R. 796. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to make technical corrections to a map relating to the Coastal Barrier Resources System; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. SCHIFF:

H.R. 797. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to reduce the amount that a multicandidate political committee may contribute to a House of Representatives candidate, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Oversight.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan (for himself, Mr. NEUMANN, and Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland):

H.R. 798. A bill to prohibit the issuance of new public debt obligations after December 31, 2001; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Oregon:

H.R. 799. A bill to require the Secretary of Agriculture to make a minor adjustment in the exterior boundary of the Hells Canyon Wilderness in the States of Oregon and Idaho to exclude an established Forest Service road inadvertently included in the wilderness; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. STARK:

H.R. 800. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require the governing boards of Medicare national accrediting entities have public representation and have public meetings as a condition of recognizing their accreditation under the Medicare Program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THORNBERRY:

H.R. 801. A bill to amend the Federal Meat Inspection Act and the Poultry Products Inspection Act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to permit the interstate distribution of State-inspected meat and poultry when the Secretary determines that State inspection requirements are at least equal to Federal inspection standards and such requirements are consistently enforced; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 802. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the estate and gift taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THUNE (for himself, Mr. SMITH of Michigan, Mr. HILL, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, Mrs. EMERSON, and Mr. POMEROY):

H.R. 803. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 relating to the treatment of livestock sold on account of weather-related conditions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TRAFICANT:

H.R. 804. A bill to amend part Q of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to ensure that Federal funds made available to hire or rehire law enforcement officers are used in a manner that produces a net gain of the number of law enforcement officers who perform non-administrative public safety services; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TRAFICANT (for himself and Mr. HUNTER):

H.R. 805. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Defense to assign Department of Defense personnel to assist the Immigration and Naturalization Service and the U.S. Customs Service in the performance of their border protection functions; to the Committee on National Security.

By Mr. VISCLOSKEY (for himself, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mrs. LOWEY):

H.R. 806. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to establish a national clean water trust fund and to authorize the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to use amounts in that fund to carry out projects to restore and recover waters of the United States from damages resulting from violations of that act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. WICKER (for himself, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. DAVIS of Virginia, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. KING of New York, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. SCHIFF, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. HYDE, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. MINGE, Mr. BRYANT, and Mr. GRAHAM):

H.R. 807. A bill to repeal the requirement relating to specific statutory authorization for increases in judicial salaries, to provide for automatic annual increases for judicial

salaries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SOLOMON (for himself, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. BAKER, Mr. BALDACCIO, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. BARCIA, Mr. BARR of Georgia, Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. BASS, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. BEREU-TER, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. BONO, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. BURR of North Carolina, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. BUYER, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. CAMP, Mr. CANADY of Florida, Mr. CANNON, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. COBLE, Mr. COBURN, Mr. COLLINS, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. COX of California, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. CRANE, Mr. CRAPO, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Ms. DANNER, Mr. DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. DELAY, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. DICKEY, Mr. DOOLEY of California, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. EDWARDS, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. ENSIGN, Mr. EHRLICH, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. EWING, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. FORBES, Mrs. FOWLER, Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. FROST, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. GANSKE, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. GOODE, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. GOSS, Mr. GRAHAM, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. GREEN, Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. HERGER, Mr. HILL, Mr. HILLEARY, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. HORN, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. HULSHOF, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. HYDE, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. JOHN, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mrs. KELLY, Mrs. KENNELLY of Connecticut, Mr. KIM, Mr. KING, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. LARGENT, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. LINDER, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, Mr. MANTON, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. MASCARA, Mr. MCDOL- LUM, Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. MCINNIS, Mr. MCINTOSH, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. METCALF, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. MURTHA, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. NEUMANN, Mr. NEY, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. NUSSLE, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PAPPAS, Mr. PARKER, Mr. PAXON, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. PITTS, Mr. QUINN, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. REYES, Mr. RIGGS, Mr. RILEY, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. ROGAN, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. DAN SCHAEFER of Colorado, Mr. BOB SCHAEFFER of Colorado, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SMITH of Oregon, Mrs. SMITH of Washington, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. STUMP, Mr. TALENT, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. THOMAS, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. TURNER, Mr. WALSH, Mr. WAMP, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, Mr. WELDON of

Florida, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. WELLER, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. WISE, Mr. WOLF, Mr. WYNN, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. YOUNG of Florida):

H.J. Res. 54. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States authorizing the Congress to prohibit the physical desecration of the flag of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEARNS (for himself, Mr. HALL of Texas, and Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma):

H.J. Res. 55. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to voluntary prayer in public schools; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOSS:

H. Con. Res. 21. Concurrent resolution providing for an adjournment of the two Houses; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. PAYNE (for himself, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. BECERRA, Ms. MCKINNEY, and Mr. NEY):

H. Con. Res. 22. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the discrimination by the German Government against members of minority religious groups, particularly the continued and increasing discrimination by the German Government against performers, entertainers, and other artists from the United States associated with Scientology; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. SKAGGS (for himself and Mr. KOLBE):

H. Con. Res. 23. Concurrent resolution expressing respect and affection for the flag of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H. Res. 56. Resolution providing amounts for the expenses of the Committee on Resources in the 105th Congress; to the Committee on House Oversight.

By Mr. SPENCE (for himself and Mr. DELLUMS):

H. Res. 57. Resolution providing amounts for the expenses of the Committee on National Security in the 105th Congress; to the Committee on House Oversight.

By Mr. FAZIO of California:

H. Res. 58. Resolution designating minority membership on certain standing committees of the House; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. GOSS:

H. Res. 59. Resolution providing amounts for the expenses of the Committee on Intelligence in the 105th Congress; to the Committee on House Oversight.

By Mr. STUMP (for himself and Mr. EVANS):

H. Res. 60. Resolution providing amounts for the expenses of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs in the 105th Congress; to the Committee on House Oversight.

By Mr. HAMILTON (for himself and Mr. DREIER):

H. Res. 61. Resolution to provide for independent investigations and factfinding for ethics investigations; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HANSEN (for himself and Mr. BERMAN):

H. Res. 62. Resolution providing amounts for the expenses of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct in the 105th Congress; to the Committee on House Oversight.

By Mr. ARCHER:

H. Res. 63. Resolution providing amounts for the expenses of the Committee on Ways and Means in the 105th Congress; to the Committee on House Oversight.

By Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin (for himself and Mr. LUTHER, and Mr. MCHALE):

H. Res. 64. Resolution requiring that travel awards that accrue by reason of official travel of a Member, officer, or employee of the House of Representatives be used only with respect to official travel; to the Committee on House Oversight.

By Mr. BURTON of Indiana:

H. Res. 65. Resolution providing amounts for the expenses of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight in the 105th Congress; to the Committee on House Oversight.

By Mr. GILMAN:

H. Res. 66. Resolution providing amounts for the expenses of the Committee on International Relations in the 105th Congress; to the Committee on House Oversight.

By Ms. GRANGER (for herself, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. FROST, Mr. DELAY, Mr. SAM JOHNSON, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. SESSIONS, and Mr. BRADY):

H. Res. 67. Resolution to express the sense of the House of Representatives concerning actions that the President of the United States should take to resolve the dispute between the Allied Pilots Associations and American Airlines; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. HAMILTON (for himself, Mr. BEREUTER, and Mr. BERMAN):

H. Res. 68. Resolution stating the sense of the House of Representatives that the Treaty of Mutual Cooperation and Security Between the United States of America and Japan is essential for furthering the security interests of the United States, Japan, and the nations of the Asia-Pacific region, and that the people of Okinawa deserve recognition for their contributions toward ensuring the treaty's implementation; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. LEACH:

H. Res. 69. Resolution providing amounts for the expenses of the Committee on Banking and Financial Services in the 105th Congress; to the Committee on House Oversight.

By Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD:

H. Res. 70. Resolution to establish a select committee to investigate CIA involvement in the financing, distribution, and promulgation of crack cocaine and the use of any proceeds to support the Contras; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SHUSTER:

H. Res. 71. Resolution providing amounts for the expenses of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure in the 105th Congress; to the Committee on House Oversight.

By Mr. SMITH of Oregon:

H. Res. 72. Resolution providing amounts for the expenses of the Committee on Agriculture in the 105th Congress; to the Committee on House Oversight.

By Mr. SOLOMON (for himself and Mr. MOAKLEY):

H. Res. 73. Resolution providing amounts for the expenses of the Committee on Rules in the 105th Congress; to the Committee on House Oversight.

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

18. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Washington, relative to House Joint Memorial 4006 encouraging greater Federal funding of research into finding the cause, prevention, and cure for breast cancer; to the Committee on Commerce.

19. Also, memorial of the Senate of the State of Washington, relative to Senate

Joint Resolution 8005 petitioning for use of the Fast Flux Test Facility to meet critical national needs; to the Committee on Commerce.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CALVERT:

H.R. 808. A bill for the relief of John M. Ragsdale; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts:

H.R. 809. A bill for the relief of Frank J. Notrem; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 1: Ms. JACKSON-LEE, Mr. DAN SCHAEFER of Colorado, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. BAKER, and Mr. TALENT.

H.R. 2: Mr. NEY, Mr. CASTLE, and Mr. BARR of Georgia.

H.R. 18: Mr. KLUG, Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, and Mr. LATHAM.

H.R. 26: Mr. COLLINS and Mr. CHAMBLISS.

H.R. 38: Ms. DUNN of Washington, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. DAVIS of Virginia, and Mr. GONZALEZ.

H.R. 45: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts and Mr. RAHALL.

H.R. 54: Mr. NEY.

H.R. 65: Ms. DUNN of Washington, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. CANADY of Florida, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. SCARBOROUGH, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. HEFNER, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. EVANS, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. OLVER, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. MASCARA, Mr. WYNN, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. WOLF, Mr. GREENWOOD, and Mr. ABERCROMBIE.

H.R. 66: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. GANSKE, Mr. BAESLER, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. STUPAK, and Mrs. THURMAN.

H.R. 74: Mr. OWENS, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. VENTO, Mr. WATT of North Carolina, Ms. JACKSON-LEE, Mrs. CARSON, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Mr. MCDERMOTT.

H.R. 80: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. POMEROY, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. STEARNS, Ms. RIVERS, and Mr. GOODLING.

H.R. 91: Mr. MICA.

H.R. 107: Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 108: Mr. FROST and Mr. SOLOMON.

H.R. 123: Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, Ms. DANNER, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. BAKER, Mr. DAN SCHAEFER of Colorado, and Mr. POMBO.

H.R. 126: Mr. GOODLING.

H.R. 143: Mr. McNULTY, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. CANADY of Florida, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. ADAM SMITH of Washington, Mr. HULSHOF, Mr. CAMP, Mr. MANZULLO, Mrs. LINDA SMITH of Washington, Mr. DREIER, Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky, Mr. METCALF, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. SAM JOHNSON, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. DICKS, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr.

WHITE, Mr. SMITH of Oregon, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. SHAW, Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. CARDIN, and Mr. COLLINS.

H.R. 144: Mr. MINGE, Mr. PEASE, and Mr. PITTS.

H.R. 146: Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina.

H.R. 147: Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. FROST, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. DELLUMS, and Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 148: Mr. BORSKI.

H.R. 150: Mr. ROTHMAN.

H.R. 155: Mr. FORD, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. FILNER, Ms. NORTON, and Mrs. CARSON.

H.R. 178: Mr. DELAHUNT and Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 181: Mr. POSHARD.

H.R. 216: Mr. WEXLER, Mr. MCHALE, Mr. KLECZKA, and Mr. MATSUI.

H.R. 217: Mr. CASTLE, Mr. BEREUTER, and Mr. BARR of Georgia.

H.R. 219: Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. BILBRAY, Ms. CHRISTIAN-GREEN, and Mr. DAVIS of Virginia.

H.R. 234: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. FILNER.

H.R. 240: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. FILNER, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. EVANS, Mr. BUYER, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. KLUG, Mr. COYNE, Mr. RAHALL, and Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 241: Mr. MARTINEZ.

H.R. 242: Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, and Mr. FOLEY.

H.R. 250: Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ.

H.R. 251: Mr. CANADY of Florida.

H.R. 279: Mr. CONYERS, Mrs. KELLY, Ms. CHRISTIAN-GREEN, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. NEY, Mr. QUINN, Mr. MCINTOSH, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. SANDLIN, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. FORD, Mr. WALSH, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. HERGER, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. SAM JOHNSON, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. BECERRA, and Mr. ROGAN.

H.R. 299: Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 303: Ms. DUNN of Washington, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. CANADY of Florida, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. SCARBOROUGH, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. HEFNER, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. EVANS, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. OLVER, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. MASCARA, Mr. WYNN, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. WOLF, Mr. GREENWOOD, and Mr. ABERCROMBIE.

H.R. 304: Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. FROST, and Ms. JACKSON-LEE.

H.R. 312: Mr. BARR of Georgia, Mr. HOSTETTLE, and Mr. PITTS.

H.R. 314: Mr. MICA.

H.R. 336: Mr. GILLMOR.

H.R. 399: Mr. HYDE, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. EVANS, and Mr. BEREUTER.

H.R. 400: Mr. HORN, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, and Mr. TOWNS.

H.R. 404: Mr. BERMAN, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. FROST, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. BONO, Mr. BALDACCI, and Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 407: Mr. LANTOS, Mr. GREEN, Ms. JACKSON-LEE, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. FARR of California, and Mrs. MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 416: Mr. RANGEL, Ms. JACKSON-LEE, and Mr. GREEN.

H.R. 417: Mr. EVANS, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. GREEN, Ms. RIVERS, Ms. JACKSON-LEE, Mr. TOWNS, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. BENTSEN, Mr. DELAHUNT, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. BAKER, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. TORRES, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. FAZIO of California, Mr. WEXLER, and Mr. COOKSEY.

H.R. 418: Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. FILNER, Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. FAZIO of California.

H.R. 432: Mr. STENHOLM.

H.R. 426: Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. JOHN, Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky, and Mr. PICKERING.

H.R. 446: Mr. CALVERT, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. ADAM SMITH of Washington.

H.R. 459: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.R. 471: Mr. CANADY of Florida, Mr. FOLEY, and Mr. DEAL of Georgia.

H.R. 484: Mr. SHADEGG.

H.R. 498: Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin.

H.R. 505: Mrs. KENNELLY of Connecticut, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. ACKERMAN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. WATT of North Carolina, and Mr. STARK.

H.R. 519: Mr. PORTER.

H.R. 525: Mr. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, and Mr. SHAW.

H.R. 539: Mr. ACKERMAN.

H.R. 543: Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. NEY, and Mr. BURTON of Indiana.

H.R. 544: Mrs. LOWEY.

H.R. 546: Mr. FROST, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. HINCHEY, and Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 551: Mrs. MEEK of Florida.

H.R. 552: Mr. GILCHREST and Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 556: Mr. TRAFICANT and Mr. McDERMOTT.

H.R. 562: Mr. CAMPBELL.

H.R. 574: Ms. ESHOO, Mr. BONIOR, and Mr. FOGLIETTA.

H.R. 586: Mrs. CHENOWETH, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. HYDE, and Mr. MANZULLO.

H.R. 590: Ms. NORTON, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mrs. LINDA SMITH of Washington, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. McDERMOTT, and Mr. MILLER of California.

H.R. 600: Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. DICKS, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mrs. KENNELLY of Connecticut,

Mr. MARKEY, Ms. McKINNEY, Mr. NADLER, Mr. PASTOR, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SERRANO, and Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 604: Mr. CANADY of Florida, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. SAM JOHNSON, Mr. BRYANT, and Mr. ROGAN.

H.R. 607: Mr. McDERMOTT and Mr. ROHRABACHER.

H.R. 610: Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 614: Mr. KLUG, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Ms. ROSELEHTINEN, and Mr. MINGE.

H.R. 615: Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 617: Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. JACKSON-LEE, Mrs. CARSON, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, and Mr. ACKERMAN.

H.R. 641: Mrs. CHENOWETH, Mr. LARGENT, and Mr. PACKARD.

H.R. 643: Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. NEY, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. EVANS, Mr. ACKERMAN, and Mr. THOMPSON.

H.R. 644: Mr. NEY.

H.R. 680: Ms. DANNER, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. FROST, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ, Mr. OLVER, Mr. MARTINEZ, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. COYNE, Mr. TORRES, Mr. BENTSEN, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, Mrs. CARSON, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. MASCARA, Mr. ROEMER, and Mr. BALDACCI.

H.R. 687: Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, and Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 688: Mr. GREENWOOD.

H.R. 694: Mr. STUPAK and Mr. TRAFICANT.

H.R. 710: Mr. ADAM SMITH of Washington.

H.R. 716: Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. KLUG, Mr. TALENT, and Mr. CUNNINGHAM.

H.R. 727: Mr. QUINN.

H.J. Res. 1: Mr. EVERETT, Mr. KINGSTON, and Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania.

H.J. Res. 6: Mr. GOODLATTE, Mrs. MYRICK, and Mr. BURR of North Carolina.

H.J. Res. 10: Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky and Mr. FOLEY.

H.J. Res. 14: Mr. BEREUTER.

H.J. Res. 16: Mrs. MYRICK.

H.J. Res. 17: Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. FROST, and Mr. LAFALCE.

H.J. Res. 28: Mr. BOUCHER.

H.J. Res. 45: Mr. FATTAH and Mr. WATT of North Carolina.

H. Con. Res. 6: Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, and Mr. EVANS.

H. Con. Res. 10: Mr. HASTINGS of Washington and Mr. SHIMKUS.

H. Res. 28: Mr. SKEEN.

H. Res. 39: Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. FROST, and Mr. BOEHLERT.

H. Res. 40: Mr. DINGELL, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. OBERSTAR, Ms. McKINNEY, Ms. JACKSON-LEE, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. SANDERS, and Ms. NORTON.

H. Res. 48: Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, Mr. GREEN, and Mr. SOLOMON.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

6. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Puerto Rico Bar Association board of directors, relative to opposition to the death penalty being imposed on Puerto Ricans; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

7. Also, petition of the municipality of Mayaguez, Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, relative to the death penalty; to the Committee on the Judiciary.